CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº LXIV. JULY 1891.

ART. I.-DIDON'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

Jésus-Christ. Par le Père DIDON, de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs. Tom. I., II. (Paris, 1891.)

WE rejoice—we trust unselfishly—at the publication of these beautiful volumes. It is not merely that the literary reader is supplied with a source of refined enjoyment, or that the preacher may bathe his jaded spirit in a newly-opened fountain and make his hearers feel that they are being led to 'fresh woods and pastures new:' each return by any considerable portion of a Christian nation to the study of the Gospels is signalized by a rejuvenescence of the Christian life. This has been noticed with profound originality by the late Dean of St. Paul's as one of the two chief characteristics of the ethical tendency of the Oxford movement.

'One of these' (writes Dean Church) 'was the increased care for the Gospels, and study of them, compared with other parts of Evangelical theology had dwelt upon the work of Christ, and laid comparatively little stress on His example, or the picture left us of His Personality and Life. It regarded the Epistles of St. Paul as the last word of the Gospel message. People who can recall the popular teaching, which was spoken of then as "sound," and "faithful," and "preaching Christ," can remember how the Epistles were ransacked for texts, while the Gospel narrative was imperfectly studied, and was felt to be much less interesting. The movement made a great change. The great Name stood no longer for an abstract symbol of doctrine, but for a living Master, who could teach as well as save. And not forgetting whither He had gone, and what He was, the readers of Scripture now sought Him largely in those sacred records where we can almost see and hear His going in and out among men. It was a change in the use of Scripture, which some can still look back to as an epoch in their religious history.'1

ates 35).

der,

Engvalue ident

concott's of the ton is

rch of ncoln

city of

Philo-), are

how-

ough;

at the

atten-

¹ The Oxford Movement, 1833-1843. By R. W. Church (pp. 167, 168). VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV. U

18

cis

lin

WC

tio

dea

of 1

sto

with

bel

don

inte

tinu

The

thei

doc

-fo

which

sole

which

treas

the inter

knov

it?

critic

doct

inter

try to

evok

wher

docu

visio

gone

preca

They

to re-

you v

some

a dev

prete

This witness, which is so true of religious growth, is almost equally true of religious quickening in any community. The image of Christ in the book, touched into life, and looking upon a generation with living eyes, necessarily arrests and awakens souls. And this new version of the Gospels, as read by a believing and most eloquent priest of the Roman Communion, passionately clinging to the old creeds, yet not afraid to illustrate the sacred text with the freedom and opulence of the best modern criticism of the Protestant schools, cannot be without a salutary influence upon all that is best in French thought and feeling. To Père Didon's work is prefixed an emphatic attestation by Father Larroca, Master-General of the Frères Prêcheurs, which speaks briefly but discriminatingly of its peculiar merits.

'This book shows Jesus Christ in the very contexture of circumstances in which He lived, dominating those circumstances by the divinity of the end which He proposed to Himself, and of the means which He employed. If the author sometimes speaks the language of our adversaries, we soon see that his dominant object is to fight them on their own ground. His success is most conspicuous when, against their impious à priori theories, he invokes the positive arguments of history. The very form of the work, at once simple and noble, answers to the greatness of the subject.'

We can say, from our Anglican point of view, that the book is composed with a noble candour as regards confessions diverging from the Tridentine standard; that the author never writes unfairly, or strikes with a poisoned dagger; and that the passages are comparatively few which a reasonable-minded Churchman would much care to controvert. His Romanism is superficial and, so to say, perfunctory: his Catholic Christianity vital and pervading. He meets the first with a respectful bow, the second with a cry of triumphant joy.

Let us proceed to point out what we consider the strong elements of this remarkable book. We may also indicate those which we respectfully venture to think less satisfactory.

I.—I. The Introduction—upon the part of criticism and history in a life of Jesus Christ—appears to us to be admirable.

Père Didon, if ready to give to the Church the things which be of the Church, demands with masculine strength for criticism that which is justly due to it. His very first proposition is that 'the first condition of a scientific history is to be enlightened by a wise, clear-sighted, impartial criti-

¹ See the 'imprimatur' before the Introduction, dated Rome, March 20, 1890.

KUM

July

h, is mity.

king

Com-

t not

and

estant

1 that

idon's

rroca,

oriefly

of cir-

of the aks the bject is

picuous

positive

ple and

book is

diverg-

never

nd that

minded

manism

c Chris-

h a re-

strong

indicate factory.

ism and

admir-

e things strength

very first

c history

ial criti-

ed Rome,

cism.' The passage in which he illustrates, explains, and limits this assertion is one of the most admirable in the work. With the exception of one expression (not essential to the argument and accompanied by a significant qualification), it may be received by every English Churchman.

'There are in history two sorts of documents—the one for a dead history, while the others are living. The first are a very débris of races, societies, civilizations, that have disappeared. Their graven stones and pillars, their parchments or bands of papyrus, covered with hieroglyphics in characters in an unknown tongue, no longer belong to anyone in particular. They have fallen into the common domain of all, and have no longer the living spirit of a people to interpret them. The other documents of which I have spoken continue to be the property of a people, of a society, of a living religion. They are written in a language which is still spoken and understood. They are preserved intact by those who live in them and fully know their value. All the Egyptian, Assyrian, Phoenician, and such-like documents belong to the first category. The Gospels occupy the first rank in the second. No book deserves better the name of living —for that which they relate is the very life of millions of consciences which think like them, direct themselves according to them, are consoled in them, hope by them. They were born in a religious society which justly regards them as its family titles, one of its most precious treasures. The society which, under the name of the Church, covers the world, presents the Gospel to all; but it belongs to her to She is the author, since the book issued from her. Who knows best the thought of any book-is it not those who conceived it? Were it necessary to prove this, I should say to all exegetical critics who allow no part whatever to the Church and its traditional doctrine in arriving at the sense of the Gospels-when you want to interpret dead documents, what method do you follow? Why, you try to reconstitute the people to whom the documents belong; you evoke it, in a sense, from the dead, and re-animate its ashes. And when you see it living before you, with its language, its manners, its doctrines—in short, with all its history—you run the risk of reading the documents, and you give your interpretation timidly and pro-visionally, for the historical resurrection of a civilization which is gone, of a people which is annihilated, must always be imperfect and precarious. But the Gospel documents are not dead documents. They belong to a living, to an emphatically living, people, which is ever growing, which teaches, which never ceases to interpret, to read, to re-animate these books. What right have you to treat them as if you were dealing with a simple papyrus, discovered in the tomb of some mummy, or with an old parchment, forgotten in the archives of a devastated town? If the Egyptians of Rameses could return to the banks of the Nile, I take it that they would be the best interpreters of their own writings. The Egyptologists would find no

1 Introduction, p. 5.

tl

ar

pa

qu

It

of

its

gua

is s

His

wor

natu

fron

char

perfe

effer But

form

cepti

difficulty in making this admission. Simply in the interests of sound criticism, and (without invoking for the Catholic Church the infallible authority which she holds from her Master for the preservation and interpretation of the Faith) I only claim for her this—that she should be treated like every other living and intelligent society; and that people would be kind enough to allow that she is in a better position than any other person to explain her own books. When this is once recognized, I make no difficulty whatever in applying to documents which have remained living in spite of their secular antiquity the method which consists in replacing these books in the medium which saw their original production, and in borrowing from the knowledge thus acquired elements of great value to their better comprehension.

Now it is, of course, evidently true that in the mind of the writer of this powerful passage the Roman doctrine of Infallibility stands in the background. We, on the other hand, firmly abide by the much-abused *via media*. To us it seems (as it seemed to Dean Church) simply the logical expression of the two facts that 'in the early and undivided Church there was such a thing as authority, and there was no such thing known as Infallibility.' But, if there be such a thing as a living, continuous Church at all, Père Didon's argument against critical reconstruction of the Faith, or of any part of it, from our modern and improved exegesis, is quite conclusive. And we sincerely wish that some of our excellent friends of a certain modern school—who have done much valuable work—would only condescend to look and write less provokingly like men who are starting on a voyage of discovery.

The passage prefixed to the chapter upon the Conception is one of the noblest and best adapted to the requirements of modern thought which can be found in the whole compass of modern literature.

'The origin of Jesus is not like ours. He is not born like us, "of blood, nor of carnal instinct, nor of will of man." Bearing, as he does, into humanity the secret and the power of being born again of the Spirit, He is born Himself of woman and of the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God is the supreme force. He commands the general evolution, and presides over the ordered and progressive movement, of the universe. As He intervened in chaos and matter to produce sensitive existence, as He intervened in animal nature to produce being which thinks; so in being which thinks He intervenes that the earth may bring forth its fruit, that humanity may see the Saviour, the Holy one, the Son of God, spring forth. The result of the earlier divine intervention was only a creature; the result in this case is on a level with the Infinite—God unites Himself personally to

² The Oxford Movement, pp. 184, 185.

¹ Jésus-Christ, tom. 1, Introd. pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.

of sound nfallible tion and e should and that position is is once cuments quity the um which nowledge tension.

od of the f Infallid, firmly ms (as it on of the here was g known a living, against f it, from ve. And ends of a e work—byokingly

e Concepuirements e compass

ike us, " of uring, as he born again irit of God. the general movement, to produce to produce treenes that ay see the he result of esult in this ersonally to

His work. As He had incarnated life in matter, sensation in life, thought in sensation, He now incarnates Himself in humanity. The various kingdoms are superposed, so to speak, and mutually envelope each other. The kingdom of life is added to that of matter, the animal kingdom to that of life, the human kingdom to that of animality. But now we have reached the kingdom of God and that of the Son of God in humanity. All these successive geneses constitute in their totality the lofty dream of the earth. They are all mysterious; and the more perfect the thing created the deeper is the mystery. Life is more hidden than matter; the animal is more enigmatic than organic life; man is more inscrutable than the animal; Jesus is more impenetrable than all. He who would scrutinize the origins of things may grasp the material conditions in which beings are produced, but the first cause eludes his experiments. Whence comes matter? whence life? whence sensitive existence? whence being which thinks? whence genius? whence comes the Christ? The science which confines itself within phenomena answers to these questions-"I do not know." The reason which perceives causes replies-"from the Spirit of God." Under what factual and historical form was the action of the Spirit manifested in the genesis of Jesus? We must ask the Gospel documents, the only pages in antiquity which teach us with any detail upon that event, concealed, almost unnoticed, which yet has succeeded in changing the face of the world.'1

We question whether any prelude to the narrative of the birth of Jesus has ever been prefixed to it fitter for the requirements of men profoundly influenced by modern thought. It is brief, luminous, and scientific. It implies a vast range of knowledge and thought, and the power of presenting it in its simplest and most concentrated form.

3. A fine and stately piece of psychology, guided and guarded by dogmatic precision, forms the framework in which is set the chapter on 'The Adolescence and Youth of Jesus; His Education.' ²

'The life of Jesus, as a boy and youth, at Nazareth, is told in two words—"He grew; He obeyed." There was nothing extraordinary, nothing startling, nothing apparently outside the lines of human nature. He developes physically like other children. He shows, from year to year, the intelligence and the virtues, the grace and the charm which are suitable to His age. No obstacle thwarts this perfect growth. The passions, as they awake, have a turnult and an effervescence which disturb the harmony of every human being. But in the soul of Jesus they are in perfect equilibrium. Evil in any form never even touches the Holy Thing which is born, in whom

¹ Jésus-Christ, liv. i. 'Les Origines de Jésus,' chap. ii. 'Sa Con ception.' Tom. i. pp. 34, 35.

dwelleth in bodily wise the fulness of God. In Him matter is penetrated by the soul, which sways and transfigures it; and the soul by the Spirit of God, which fills it and makes it divine. No psychology can analyse the irradiations of God in the soul of Jesus; no science will ever grasp the beauty of that body vibrating and growing up under the rays and impulses of a soul which the Infinite pervades with His breath and grace. He is the ideal infant and youth, as presently He will be the ideal man. There is this difference between Him and the sons of earth—that the best of us aspire to an ideal perfection which we never reach, whilst He realizes the absolute The total personal union of the human and divine nature gave type. Him the intuition of infinite truth, the possession of infinite love, the unbroken enjoyment of infinite beauty; but it did not hinder the development of experimental knowledge in His reason; nor, again, the progressive exercise of virtues, the effort of the will—any more than it obviated bodily fatigues, labour, and pain. This is the essential appanage of the earthly man. Jesus willed to have it whole and entire, with its weakness, its misery, and its mortality. His union with God excepted Him from nothing but sin and imperfection. The most different moods could co-exist simultaneously in His soul without mutual exclusion or destruction. His intuition is compatible with experimental knowledge; His divine joys are allied to nameless sufferings, and His most trying struggles to an unalterable serenity.'1

This is the flower of Aquinas, and of Aquinas where he is at his best.

4. We must, unwillingly, close our quotations with one lengthened extract:

What was the wilderness to which the Spirit led our Lord?

'The writings of the Evangelists have not specified it particularly; but it is certain that the word $\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\sigma$ s used by them with the singular article, and without an epithet, can only refer to the desert of Judea. Ancient tradition has always sought and adored the footsteps of Jesus in the wild and mountainous region which stretches to the west, above Jericho, towards the heights of Bethany, bounded on the south by Wâdy Kelt, on the north by Wâdy Mutyah.

'Jesus, on departing from the Jordan, would cross the plain of Jericho, and, leaving the town to the left, He would climb the rugged

steeps of the mountain now called Quarantania.

This craggy range is formed of an immense block of roseate limestone, which appears to have been calcined by volcanic action. Its lofty summits rise in five pyramid-like cones, separated by deep ravines. Winds and rains have hollowed in the rocky face of the mountain many a cave, which the hand of the solitary hermit has enlarged. About the middle of the highest peak faith has venerated one grotto where Jesus may have taken shelter during His abode in the wilderness; a path cut in the rock leads to it. Some Greek monks live there, far above the world, their only companions the birds of heaven—the ring-dove and the eagle.

a

0

H

m

Te

fr

H

¹ Tom. i. liv. i. chap. v. pp. 78, 79.

287

1891

matter is the soul sychology o science owing up pervades youth, as e between an ideal absolute ature gave e love, the ninder the nor, again, -any more his is the ve it whole

His union ction. The His soul compatible o nameless serenity.'1 here he is

with one

Lord? articularly; the singular rt of Tudea. footsteps of to the west, on the south

the plain of the rugged

k of roseate canic action. eparated by the solitary st peak faith helter during k leads to it. r only com-

'The eye pauses delighted on the panorama which the horizon embraced from the top of the mountain encircles. To the east, beyond the plain of Jordan, Mount Nebo and the uplands of Perea: to the left, Hermon, hiding in luminous depths his head of sun-gilded snow; to the south, the Dead Sea, glimmering like a shield of burnished gold; to the west, the desert land of Judea, rising in innumerable heights, scarce clothed with the scanty grass which the rains of winter bring forth only to be burnt up by the summer sun. Jerusalem is hidden by the Mount of Olives, on which in our day hangs a white tower, raised like a signal over the waves of that ocean of tossed but motionless stone.

'It is both the mountain and the desert, with their two imposing

elements of austerity and majesty.

'Such might truly be the wilderness to which Jesus retired.

'The rock was His refuge; He dwelt in the midst of the wild beasts; the heaven over His head was full of lights and divine voices. When the traveller wanders through this dead nature it is peopled with these sacred memories. The image of the living Christ seems to float over these hills; we enter into the drama of His inward thoughts, and we gaze on these fragments of rock with respect, for perhaps He has rested on them.

'When from these heights Jesus looked on the plain of the Jordan which He had just left, He could see the crowds thronging by all its paths to the man who was preparing His way; on the opposite side of the horizon He had beneath His eyes that road from Jericho to Jerusalem which He was one day to traverse with His

disciples to go to His death.

'The abode of Jesus in the wilderness was at once a prayer, a contemplation, and an absorption of all His human faculties in God Those who have had experience of visions and ecstasies, who have drunk long draughts of joys divine, and heard, like St. Paul, "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter," the saints alone can catch some faint ray from the soul of Jesus, praying, adoring, contemplating. He saw in the will of His Father the grandeur and the beauty of His future mission. He measured its difficulties and foresaw its sorrows and its sacrifice; before entering upon it He entered into all the counsels of infinite wisdom, justice, and mercy to save a fallen world. His agony, Calvary, and death were unveiled to His eyes in that eternal light; He knew the rapture of the soul filled with the joys of God, and the anguish of the soul overwhelmed by the knowledge of the fearful struggles that awaited Him.

'The desert has always had an irresistible attraction for religious minds—all must pass through it, for it is the threshold of active life. Jesus often afterwards advised solitude; He practised it Himself as a condition of prayer, a means of rest to the mind, and an escape

from plots and persecution.

'Now by thus retiring after His baptism, He passed through, after His own manner, that phase of total withdrawal from the world which in the life of men of action precedes the execution of their work. He who is conscious of a great mission, overwhelmed by the weight of his responsibility, terrified by his own weakness, seeks to withdraw into himself, far from disturbing influences; solitude draws him near to God, purifies his thoughts, tempers his manly resolutions, makes

his courage bolder, and increases his strength.

'Moses sought God on the solitary height of Horeb; Elijah asked of the wilderness a refuge against man; John the Baptist lived there, growing and waxing strong in spirit; Paul fled into the uninhabited plains of Arabia to meditate on Him who had overthrown him at the gates of Damascus; and the disciples of the Crucified, escaping the temptations of the world, absorbed in contemplation, hungering after life eternal, would one day bury themselves in crowds in the holes of the rocks of the Thebaid.

'The work that Jesus had to accomplish did not permit Him to tarry long in the wilderness: He only made a pause there. He did not come, like us, to seek for God, for He bore God within Him, nor to meditate on His word, for He heard it always and everywhere—at Nazareth as at the Jordan, in the midst of the crowd as in the silence of Nature. Nor, again, did He come to ripen the plan of His Messiahship—this plan was whole and entire in the Spirit, which was His light, His counsellor, and the impulse of His powers, ever fully and freely obeyed.

The greatest among religious men withdraw into the wilderness to recruit their energy, Jesus went to show forth His. They go for solitude and peace, Jesus went for strife. They ask of the wilderness a refuge against evil, Jesus went that He might meet the attacks of

Satan and overcome him.

'He who has been proclaimed by God Himself to be His Son will not shun the saddest condition of humanity. He has already made in baptism a public profession of expiation and sacrifice; He will submit to the law of probation under a mysterious and daring form which defies human reason, but whose enigma the historian must try to penetrate.

'Trial and probation are two synonymous terms. Applied to free beings, these acts have the effect of showing their value and their

virtue

'Probation, or temptation, is an obstacle set before them between their will and their duty: will which acts, and duty which is the rule and end of action. The obstacle may come in the first place from our own nature, which has an instinctive repugnance to effort, to sorrow, to sacrifice, and to death. There is no man whom duty does not condemn to suffering and to sacrifice. On a great number it imposes long sufferings. Some, the best and the bravest, it commands to die. This is the universal probation of every creature gifted with free will—he seeks after God in the accomplishment of his destiny, and to reach God he must sacrifice himself.

'Whoever has observed and analysed his own nature must surely have discovered there, amidst his noblest aspirations and holiest impulses, discordant powers, which constitute for him, and within him, a continual temptation to turn from duty and the true purpose of his

lite.

1891

thdraw m near makes

n asked I there, habited n at the ing the ng after noles of

Him to He did im, nor ere—at silence fessiah-lis light, d freely

lderness y go for lderness tacks of His Son

already ice; He 1 daring historian

d to free nd their

the rule ace from effort, to luty does umber it it comure gifted at of his

oliest imthin him, ose of his 'Sensuality and pride separate us from God; the first, with strong attraction, bids us enjoy to excess all that satisfies our earthly passions; the other turns us back on ourselves, to find in our own mind and will the rule of our thoughts and the direction of our life.

'These are the two forms of egotism which ferment in the depth of our double nature: one is the egotism of matter, refusing to submit to the Spirit and to God; the other is the sensuality of the mind, delighting in itself and resisting God, the Author of matter and mind.

'Every human being who is mastered by these powers becomes, in his own circle, ambitious and an oppressor; he seeks greedily after power—that is to say, he would rule and enslave, he would rule to enslave, and be a slave that he may rule. Violence and cunning, homicide and lying, menace and flattery—this is his code and his practical science.

'All disorders of the passions come from sensuality; all aberrations of the mind have their source in pride; and sensuality and pride are the result of egotism, or an ill-regulated love of self which leads man to constitute himself the centre of everything. This is the evil which corrodes humanity, impedes its development, and evermore disturbs its peace. . . .

'All the nature and power of sin are evidently shown forth in this sad page of the life of Jesus. Man may learn from it with what a terrible power he has to contend to do his duty here below and to fulfil the purpose of God in him.

'Evil is in him, inherent in his very self, in his faculties, in his instincts, in the matter with which he is impregnated, in that hunger which seizes him the moment he draws breath, whose tyrannical appeals will be too soon explained by his passions. It is in that ineradicable pride which separates him from God, and invites him to vanity, to ostentation, to all that can feed his love of self. It is in that ambition of ruling and oppressing, of making himself the centre of a kingdom where he shall be all-powerful—in that practical negation of God, whose place he would usurp, and in that idolatry which would deify himself, his errors, his passions, and his vices.

'All the proceedings of the spirit of evil are here unveiled. His assaults, which Jesus repelled, are ever repeated in the life of every man and of all humanity. Man is ever at war with Satan, whose suggestions encompass the earth—this wilderness which is the place of our probation. The same subtlety, the same false wisdom, dazzle us with their glamour, flatter our inferior nature, and seek to subdue it. The evil One insinuates himself even into the holiest of men, even into those who live trusting in the Providence of the Father; he borrows, to seduce them, the words of God, altering their truth; he seeks to lull their courage by persuading them that God will do all, and that they may provoke any peril; he fascinates us all with dreams of ambition, he exalts us within ourselves as he bore Christ to the summit of the mountain, and he promises us glory and power, always on the same condition—that we obey him and worship him.

'These three temptations embrace the whole circle of our active condition in its relation to matter, to God, and to human society. Jesus willed to know them all and to overcome them. It is especially in this that He is like us, that He realises in its fulness our true human nature, and remains the eternal type of the tempted. "We have not," says an Apostle, "a High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." The spirit of evil has not touched Him, it flies from Him for ever; the personal strife will never be renewed. No direct power will henceforth be given to the devil over Jesus: he will tremble before Him, and cry out as He draws near—"what have we to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God? Art Thou come hither to torment us before the time?"

'Jesus, after this time of suffering, tasted sensibly of the joys of His divinity. "Angels," say the Evangelists, "came and ministered unto Him." All the hosts of heaven were ever at His order. In the hours of the temptation, by the will of their Master, they veiled their presence; when Satan was repulsed, they reappeared. Messengers between God and man, these heavenly agents bring down to us His strength, His favour, as ether transmits into space the light and the

heat of the sun.

'Jesus lived surrounded by their invisible phalanx. He saw them watching from above over the children, the little ones; He knew them ready to serve Him, yet He would not when He could ask of His Father to send His faithful legions to succour Him. He lived forgetful of Himself, never pleading for the preservation of that human nature whose burdens He had assumed. For Him, as for us, life was made up of joys and sorrows, of crushing trials and dazzling triumphs. His time of joy was short—a brief space between ever-recurring warfare, just enough to give breathing-time to His will. Joy is born of trial, it grows with trial; it is the balm and oil; it heals the wounded soul, it anoints the athlete, and makes his members fit for higher fights. Those who have experienced how much consolation, serenity, and holy rapture God has vouchsafed to His martyred servants, will understand the profound meaning of the sequel to the temptation of Jesus.

'This fact, so mysterious as a whole and in its details, has been entirely misunderstood by all those modern historians who make the fundamental principle of their criticism to consist in the negation of

the supernatural.

'The appearance of evil as a personal being, the magical power which he used, the wonderful manner in which Jesus was transported by the tempter to the top of the mountain and the pinnacle of the temple, the angels surrounding Him and ministering to Him when the devil was conquered—these things are too much for a godless

philosophy and a material science.

'And yet exegesis forbids us to give any explanation of the history of the temptation other than the faithful exposition which we have laid before the reader. To deny the objective reality of the scenes that compose it, and to see in them only an internal vision of which the imagination of Jesus was the theatre, is to falsify it designedly. There would be a puerile improbability in supposing, according to the old

uly

ally

rue

We

hed

e as

a, it

ved.

he

ave

ther

s of

ered

heir

gers

the

saw

ould He

that

s for

ween

His

loil;

s his

how

ed to

f the

been

e the

on of

power

orted of the

when

odless

istory

e laid

es that

ch the

There he old German rationalist, that the devil was a perfidious envoy from the Sanhedrim, some powerful and crafty Pharisee who sought to turn away Jesus from His mission, and played the part of Satan in the drama.

Others have only seen in it a parable for teaching man the way to overcome temptation, told by Jesus to His disciples, who mistook Him and changed it to an actual fact. But Jesus never made Himself the subject of a parable, and, if He did not on this occasion, how can we explain that the disciples should have substituted their Master for the fictitious person of the original narrative?

'The mythic school sees only a legend in the story of the temptation. In vain it has multiplied its efforts and ransacked the Old Testament to show in what manner the first Christians conceived and built it up. It has evoked the temptation of the first pair in Eden, that of Abraham, that of the people of Israel in the wilderness, to find a model for the temptation of Jesus. It has appealed to the abstract idea of the opposition between the Messiah and His adversary, an opposition which must engender an image of strife between the two and the defeat of the latter. It did not fail to observe in describing the theatre of the conflict that the wilderness was considered to be the abode of demons. But there is a manifest impossibility in constructing with these mythical aids the drama of the three temptations with its high moral ideas.

'The French critical school has taken less pains. It has simply acknowledged the historical truth of the abode of Christ in the wilderness and His rigorous fast; but the imagination of the disciples supplied the rest. They invented the trials which He endured in that barren place and created the legend—an arbitrary hypothesis which no document supports, and of no value except as an expedient to set aside facts in opposition to the philosophy of the writer. History thus treated would become a thing shifting and changeable, and there would be left of the facts that compose it only such as favour the caprice of personal systems and opinions.

'By what strange aberration could the Apostles have dreamed thus of their Master? Was it not repugnant to all their feelings, and almost sacrilege, to admit that the Son of God could be subjected to the power of the tempter? Reality alone could have persuaded them of it; and how can it be explained that such scenes were actually believed, and told, and written, unless they really took place? All that side of the life of Jesus which was sad and painful was only with difficulty and in process of time understood by His disciples. It needed the teaching of the Holy Spirit to give them comprehension of the suffering Messiah. The tempted Messiah is one of the first, one of the deepest, manifestations of the mystery of His sorrows.

'The latest representatives of the German critical school have also condemned the letter of this history, considering it unworthy of Christ and unacceptable in its details to a reason which is enlightened and without superstition. They have treated it as fiction, essaying lamely, and in vulgar language, to describe the struggles that Jesus endured, either at the beginning or in the course of His career. Two ques-

tions, according to them, must have agitated the soul of Jesus: the duty of fulfilling His part as the Messiah, and the choice of the means necessary for that fulfilment. They have determined to see in these two questions the subject of those internal conflicts by which Jesus was laboriously led to complete knowledge and to the fulfilment of His purpose. But the evangelical documents do not show the smallest trace of these human infirmities. The Christ whom they thus depict is not the Christ of history. He is a creature of the fancy of the critic. He may be like the man whom we acknowledge in ourselves, but he is not the type-Man whom the Evangelist revealed and whom Jesus realised.

'The precise, carefully detailed, and, in all essentials, concordant testimony of St. Matthew and St. Luke will not permit us to take exception to the reality of an account which in its origin can only be

referred to Jesus Himself.

'At what moment of His life did Jesus confide to His disciples what He experienced in the wilderness at the opening of His mission in the solitude where He first was tempted? It is difficult to say, in default of any precise indication. Perhaps it was at that farewell Passover where He opened His heart, full of love and sorrow, in sweetest confidence to His disciples. "Ye call Me Master and Lord," He said, with many other tender words, "and so I am; and now, if I have never deviated from the path set before Me in spite of trials and temptations, ye must not leave it either. I have given you an example.

'And at that same hour, foreseeing the terrible trials that would befall His disciples, He comforted them by saying—"be of good cheer: I have overcome the world." Was not this an allusion to His temptation in the wilderness, where He had effectually conquered "the prince of this world "—the evil One who is ever stirring up hatreds which prompt bad men to persecute the disciples of Christ and to seek to hinder His work?' 1

We have here the contrast of ancient faith with the best lights of modern criticism. The great chapter of the temptation is set in a frame which is indeed picturesque, but not one atom or line of which is imaginary. The superficial likeness, the real unlikeness, of the analogies to the Saviour's withdrawal into the wilderness are indicated with an historian's research and with a philosopher's penetration. The contradictions and absurdities really inherent in all rationalizing explanations are brought out with irresistible force. We wish that the writer of one of the freshest and most delightful modern books upon the Gospels would revise one chapter after carefully reading Père Didon upon this subject. 'I hold,' writes the Master of Trinity Hall, 'that we have here a representation of our Lord's inward conflicts, clothed by Him in a

¹ Tom. i. liv. i. chap. iii. pp. 155-177.

e

h

W

y

d

nt

ke

be

es

on

in

ell

in 1,"

fI

als

an

ald

er:

np-

the

eds l to

est

ta-

not

ke-

ur's

ın's

lic-

ex-

rish

tful

oter

old,

pre-

in a

garb of outward imagery, that they might be better understood.' Mr. Latham, with his penetrating insight, has seen that 'the substance of the narrative must have come from our Lord'—that there are insuperable difficulties in referring it to any other source—but argues that the story deals with inner struggles in a figurative way, the inner being personified and the outer localized.\(^1\) And, finally, the essential unity of St. John with the synoptics, and the source from which they must have derived their narratives of an incident, the invention of which is utterly inconceivable, are indicated with true critical power and spiritual insight. With Dr. Mill's Sermons on the Temptation and Bossuet's Traité du Libre Arbitre et de la Concupiscence, present to our memory, we find something in this chapter more satisfactory and more complete.

II. We proceed to speak, respectfully but without doubt,

of deficiencies in this really remarkable book.

1. If its style is noble, its dogmatic grasp powerful, its arrangement luminous, yet its scholarship, for English or German readers, is lax and slovenly to a degree. Multitudes of references of primary importance are omitted; very many are given quite erroneously. There are few or no signs of a really careful independent exegesis, though the writer 'orientates himself' occasionally by a free and bold reliance upon good Protestant authorities, even when they differ from the Vulgate. After the usual French fashion no index is supplied, in a case where an index would be of special value. If we could suppose that this review would ever meet Père Didon's eye, we should recommend one course to him with respectful confidence. To trust some able young English theological student from one of our Universities would not be a greater act of faith in the honour of one outside the Roman Communion than it has already been to trust the writings of Godet and others so far as our author has manfully done.

Another graver and more serious deficiency must be noticed. The Death, Burial, and Resurrection of our Lord are handled in a very meagre and almost hurried style. 'La Mort de Jésus, et au delà' occupies not quite forty pages of these very large volumes. Of these 'Jésus ressuscité' fills scarcely twenty-three. The mode of treatment also is thin and commonplace. It is neither scientific nor devotional. It possesses neither much to elevate prayer, nor much to

stimulate curiosity, nor much to repress doubt.

Let us give two instances of our meaning. We hope that

¹ Pastor Pastorum, chap. v. pp. 112-46.

we shall not be accused of presumption if we attempt to add for ourselves what the great preacher seems to have unaccountably omitted. (1) Of the fourth word from the Cross, 'My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?' Père Didon gives the old, and most true, theological exposition, briefly and baldly:

'Between Jesus and His Father the relation is indissoluble. They are one. The Father can no more abandon the soul of His Son than the consciousness of Jesus can shut itself against the love of the Father. But it was in the counsels of the Father to deliver His Son defenceless to all the outrage and hatred of His enemies. In the midst of the flood of bitterness in which He was drowned it would seem that, by a secret design of God, in order that the victim of Calvary should drain the full cup of human suffering, Jesus no longer felt the joy of His union with His Father. The union was not, could not be, broken. He had the consciousness, but not the happy enjoyment of it. Hence the cry, "My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?" This is the beginning of a psalm filled with complaints, whose full anguish Jesus only knew and tasted, and which gave a prophetical translation to the hour of His punishment.1 The cry of Jesus, *Eloi*, *Eloi*, was received by the spectators with a "Let be," said the spectators; "He calleth for Elias." '2

Now, as we have said, Père Didon's brief dogmatic statement has our reverential assent. But he has failed to enable his lay readers to grasp the circumstances which give such awful meaning to the word, or to descend to the depths from which alone the doubts so plausibly and eloquently put in France and Germany can be answered. We happen to know that among thoughtful French Christians no portion of Renan's Vie de Jésus has produced such intense distress as that in which he clothes Strauss's objections to this utterance of the dying Saviour in his own coloured and attractive style. For an important section of his readers P. Didon affords no help here.

The view which we should wish to see set forth is this: the fourth word in its exact form is given by St. Mark.³

First of all the word was actually spoken. It is a note-worthy—we were almost disposed to write a *tremendous*—fact, that this is the *only one* of the sayings from the Cross recorded by the first two Evangelists. How strange this is

¹ Here P. Didon gives a translation of a large portion of the 21st Psalm from the Hebrew, by Père Scheil, of the Frères Prêcheurs, which seems to us to be of a very high order of excellence.

Jésus-Christ, liv. v. chap. xi. tom. ii. 342-4.
 St. Mark xv. 33, 34; cf. the Aramaic words preserved in v. 41, vii. 34, xiv. 42.

ly

or

ly

es

nd

ey

on

he

Iis

In it

im no

vas

the

vhy

led

and

nt.1

h a

ite-

ble

ful

ich

nce

hat

in's

in

the

yle.

no

nis:

ote-

is-

ross

s is

21st

hich

, vii.

we may partly conceive by supposing a group of witnesses to arrive after having been present at the death of a martyred missionary. Friends of the man and of his work, we will say, have assembled to meet those who have looked upon the holy death, or to hear a narrative drawn up by one who was present, and who has sent it for their edification. They listen with rapt attention, and wait breathlessly for the last words of the servant of God—'what did he say?' 'This: "My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?"' And be it remembered that for several years the Church had no last word of her Lord upon the Cross, written, but this alone.

Now, the very fact that this word may so easily and obviously be misconstrued makes us sure that it never *could* have been invented. Like the narrative of Gethsemane, it

must be historical.

'Legends falsify.' No doubt-but on the side of splendid exaggeration. No legend shows us the demigod or hero writhing in the dust with a sweat of blood. No legend bids us listen to one last word like the fourth from the Cross. 'Last words are often invented, or grow up spontaneously, the creation of popular feeling.' No doubt. An instance has occurred within the last few years. Everyone remembers that touching scene where Thackeray tells us how, at the last bell, the old Colonel said 'Adsum!' 'And then he, whose heart was as a little child's, stood in the presence of the Master.' We have been told that this is placed as an inscription over the tomb in a Scotch church of the fine old officer from whom Thackeray drew his portrait of Colonel Newcome, and that local feeling believes intensely that the word 'adsum' literally was the last spoken by the brave old man who rests beneath the stone. But assuredly legendary tradition in the Church would not have been tempted to select words so apparently desponding and heart-broken for the dying Son of God. 'Credo, quia impossible est,' is rather the Christian's instinctive feeling as he thoughtfully reads this part of the legend of the two earliest Evangelists.

To ourselves the Church seems to be in possession of the key to the whole difficulty—we mean, as it affects the *character* of our Lord, not as it affects the *mystery* which underlies the whole subject. It consists in our way of answering the obvious question—'who and what is He who spoke these strange words?' Now we say—'we believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, God of God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was conceived by the Holy Ghost of the

-1

re

d

T

W

ig

aı

hi

po

tw

an

th

me

tw

ha

no

sto

ha

the

oth

tha

Virgin Mary, and was made Man, and suffered for us under Pontius Pilate.'

Now, if the sufferer were anything short of this, what would follow from this exclamation? Why that which Strauss and Renan have ventured to say. He clung to illusions. As the darkness deepened over Calvary; as the last golden drops of the young life fell upon the dust of Golgotha; no smile reached Him from His Father's face, no angel's wing came to His help. As He was left to go down with thieves, amid ribald execrations, He added one other to the list of young souls whose expectations have been belied by the cynical logic of events. We admit that He was too cruelly punished; and we pity the enthusiast, yet with a certain degree of reservation

Thus the Christ who is not the Church's Christ is discrowned by His own exclamation.

But, let us take the Catholic Creed with us as we stand by the Cross, and our construction is very different.

'It was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the land until the ninth hour.' The darkness was not that of an eclipse. 'The earth did quake, and the rocks were rent.' The darkness was the seismic obscuration now so familiar to the observers of earthquakes. The august Sufferer was silent in the sultry darkness for three hours. Then death approached.

But, it may be urged, we are no nearer to any solution of the difficulty. Why should He not have met death calm and kingly, with such superb self-control as that of the German Kaisers, at whose death-beds Europe assisted a few years ago?

Because He who is God from God, made Man for us men and for our salvation, was crucified. For one with such a nature and such a mission death had two conditions: (1) it was a death which bore the punishment of sin—'He was bruised for our iniquities;' 'He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin;' 'His own self bore our sins in His own body to the tree.' For a conception of the peculiar and ineradicable bitterness of sin, we may turn to Moses, 'the ocean of theology.' It is deprivation of the presence of God. His alienation or withdrawal —what must that have been for three long hours of suffering to Him who has given us the autobiography of His inner life in five words—'I live

¹ St. Luke xxiii. 44. ⁹ St. Matt. xxvii. 51.

ירייתם אחרדונאתי (Numbers xiv. 34), 'Ye shall know my alienation' (R. V.), lit. 'negation, keeping back, standing off.'

July under

what trauss

s. As drops smile

ame to , amid

young ynical ished; reser-

is dis-

stand

rkness ss was e rocks on now st Suf-

tion of lm and erman years

Then

us men such a : (I) it Ie was to be sins in eculiar Moses, ence of at have

- I live ienation'

s given

by the Father'? This fourth word, therefore, comprehensively expresses the punishment of man's sin in man's representative.

(2) And yet, again, He 'by grace of God tasted death for every man,' i.e. for each and all. The Prince of Life felt death as the death of humanity. The heart of God felt death in the dying heart of man. Then death died in the heart of God. The dereliction melted in depths of light. 'My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?'2 There was no impatience, no ignorance, no despair. There had been real suffering in His soul, and He utters it in a sweet protest. But the sentence leaps to His lips as if with a shout of triumph. The darkness was over. God is 'My God.' The withdrawal is past once for all.3

We heartily wish that, in lieu of his brief and didactic treatment of this word from the Cross, Père Didon had expressed in his own beautiful style these and other thoughts much needed by very many readers. Surely he would have done well to point out that this could not have been the only sentence pronounced by the dying Lord which is recorded by the first two Evangelists, except upon the hypothesis that they viewed His Passion and work as the Catholic Church does in her Creed, and that the Eli cry was not to them a voice of mere anguish of soul as such, but the expression of one who, as the God-Man, 'was made sin' and 'tasted death for every

We had noted much more under this head, but we must pass on to the Resurrection chapter, which seems to us still more inadequate.

Let us take one incident—the Easter walk of the two disciples to Emmaus. This is despatched by our author in two dry and inanimate pages, which give one the notion of having been written for circles where the New Testament is not familiar. The glow, the life, the tenderness of the original story are strangely wanting. We have a few withered leaves handed to us as a specimen of the beauty of the forest.

A writer like Père Didon, we should have expected, would have brought out for the troubled hearts of French Christians the personal attestation of the author of the narrative, and the inner correspondence of that narrative 4 with those of the other Evangelists.

Let us attempt to indicate the lines on which we think that Père Didon should have moved.

¹ Κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν Πατέρα, St. John vi. 57.
2 Ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῆ μεγάλη, St. Mark xv. 34.
4 St. Luke xxiv. 13-40. VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

2. We have here a personal attestation. We have probably the attestation of St. Luke himself (though that is not necessary for our argument). The question has often been asked whether St. Luke was one of the seventy disciples. Quite clearly he could not have been one of the 'eye-witnesses from the beginning,' from whom he separates himself in the first sentence of his Gospel. Yet the wide-spread tradition that he was a personal follower, and in some sense a personal disciple, of Jesus, must have had some substantial basis. This may well have been his record of an Easter walk to Emmaus, in which he himself took part. The whole narrative is touched with the Evangelist's softest and grandest pencil. It is characterized at once by fulness, by familiarity, by majesty.

We are entitled to ask how the facts *could* have been written by any but an eye-witness, or by one who moulded his history from the lips of, or from a document supplied by, an eye-witness?

There are *literary* no less than *physical* impossibilities. One is often led to wish that the instructive Introductions prefixed by Sir Walter Scott to some of his novels were as much read as they deserve. In the Introduction to the Monastery Scott speaks of his failure to interest the public in the Abbot, and throws much of the blame upon the introduction of the White Lady of Avenel. He proceeds to assert the inevitable failure of 'supernatural machinery' in fiction. He seems inclined to except almost alone Ariel, that beautiful creation of Shakespeare's fancy. He might have added that Shakespeare himself is not successful when he advances beyond astral or fairy beings, varying, capricious, inconstant, yet not altogether unkindly. In Hamlet the impression produced by the Ghost upon those who behold him is given with an awful majesty unmatched in human literature; but the Ghost's own language is by no means equal.1

Is it not, then, what we have called a *literary impossibility*, that the company of Galileans could have supplied a writer

- ¹ Mar. Speak to it, Horatio.
 - Hor. What art thou that usurp'st this time of night, Together with that fair and warlike form
 - In which the majesty of buried Denmark Did sometime march?
 - Mar. We do it wrong, being so majestical, To offer it the show of violence.
 - Ber. It was about to speak, when the cock crew.
 - Hor. And then it started, like a guilty thing Upon a fearful summons.
- The language of the Ghost (act i. scene 5) is not maintained throughout at all at the same high level.

robably necesn asked Ouite es from he first on that personal . This mmaus, touched is cha-

ty. ve been noulded olied by, ibilities.

ductions were as to the oublic in ntroduco assert fiction. peautiful ded that dvances constant, ion prois given ire; but

ssibility, a writer

hroughout

thus perfectly and equably at home with the majesty of style of a Risen God? More especially so as the writer would not have been sustained by the strong tide of imagination, which buoys up the inventor of a happy fiction, but depressed by the leaden weight which a forger drags at his ankles. He would not have been borne by the storm-footed steeds of enthusiasm, but by the dull hoofs which every lie is forced to employ. Indeed, if some forgotten Shakespeare had existed among that simple company, no degree of genius could have enabled him to move securely and gracefully on ranges so high and difficult. No one, therefore, who was not presentsupposing that he could have told so naturally about the feelings 1 as well as the words and actions of the two-could have invented those inimitable sentences, and placed them in the lips of Jesus. Well may M. Renan say that 'the episode is one of the finest, of the most delicately and perfectly pencilled, in any language.'

We have said that we hold that St. Luke himself was one of the two disciples, and we abide by this opinion (in spite of one or two difficulties) for two reasons, over and above the verve and perfect naturalness of the narrative. (1) The disciple whose name is mentioned was almost certainly of Hellenic origin. This renders it more probable that his companion was so also.2 (2) But we are much more influenced by the sacred delicacy of the exquisite reserve in the expressive and significant 'the one of them whose name was Cleopas'- that silent, tender protest against modern

self-advertisement.3

We conclude, on the whole, that the narrative of the Easter walk to Emmaus is either a history of that which the Evangelist himself saw and heard, or the substance of a document or statement by an eye-witness which St. Luke

 St. Luke xxiv. 14, 15, 17, 32.
 Κλεόπας is contracted from Κλεόπατρος. The Cleopas in St. Luke is erroneously identified in Marg. A. V. with the 'Cleophas' of John xix. 25. The latter should be given as *Clopas*, which is one transliteration of the Aramæan קלפא of which 'Adoaios is another. (See Mill, Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, pp. 228, 229; Bretschn. Lex. Harm. N. T., sub v.) We may surely connect the presence of these two disciples, Cleopas and Luke, with the Έλληνές τινες, St. John xii. 20.

The lofty and tender reserve of St. John veils itself similarly (John

xiii. 22, xviii. 15, xix. 27, xx. 2, 3, 4, 8, xxi. 7, 20). Indeed, it would appear as if this were a principle common to all the Evangelists. Contrast St. Matthew's sternly reserved account of his call (ix. 9, 14) with St. Mark ii. 15 sqq., St. Luke v. 29 sqq. St. Mark probably indicates himself (St. Mark xv. 53), an incident psychologically quite on the same line with the trait of Mark's character, Acts xv. 37.

0

li

li

th

y

m

V

it

th

tu

W

ti

al

th

di

di

is

pl

pi

(S

.68

br

pa

H

tr

incorporated in his memoir, as he has frequently done elsewhere.

 We still more regret that Père Didon should have failed to notice the unity of essential principle in all the accounts of the Risen Lord.

The rigid abstinence from any attempt to record appearances to hostile or even indifferent witnesses is most remarkable. But at present we can only dwell upon the unity of statement as to the effect produced. That effect was joy. There was a moment of terror. Then joy filled their hearts and ran over. Each face of those who saw Him wore that smile from thenceforth. Byron's once famous lines on Greece, in spite of some obscurities and intermixture of inferior material, have never lost their hold on the human heart for the eternal truth that is in some of them. They possess that which Wordsworth considered the infallible mark of the highest poetry—they are *inevitable*.

'He who hath bent him o'er the dead, Ere the first day of death is fled, Ere yet decay's effacing fingers Have swept the lines where beauty lingers, And mark'd the mild angelic air, The rapture of repose that's there. . . . Some moments, aye, one treacherous hour, He still might doubt the tyrant's power—So fair, so calm, so softly seal'd The first last look by death reveal'd.'

Now that smile to which we refer, and which Byron's lines-describe, is ordinarily seen only in death. Over all the stillness, under all the coldness as of snow or of marble, what are those radiances, what that smile? It is wonder, love, rest, discovery; and all that meeting of lights without a name is joy in Christ's sense of the word. There was some of that light on all who saw the Risen Jesus. 'I will see you again; and your heart shall rejoice; and your joy no man taketh from you.' 3

It may be said that there is nothing very remarkable in the fact that *joy* is attributed to the disciples by the Evangelists. If the disciples supposed that their Master had risen they *must* have rejoiced; if the story was invented it would not need much psychological skill to represent them as rejoicing.

¹ Πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι (Luke xxiv. 37) ; ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ (Mark xvi. 8 : no Gospel ever *ended* with that word!).

² St. Luke xxiv. 40, St. John xx. 20. ³ St. John xvi. 22.

July 1891

lse-

iled:

ints.

ear-

ırk-

7 of

joy.

arts

that

ece,

ma-

the

that

the

ines-

still-

are

rest.

joy

ight

and

rom

le in

nge-

isen

ould

as as

But a little reflection will show that the joy is evidently fatal to that hypothesis, which is mainly resorted to by modern rationalists to account for the belief of the disciples in the Resurrection.

Every effect must have a cause.

Now what is implied about the appearance of the Crucified on the first Easter?

He had a form elastic and radiant, with the heaviness lifted off, so that it seemed 'different' to the two disciples. No more of the lash and stain of blood; no more of the awful circlet of the crown of thorns, of the pale and dying lips. The voice was at once the same, and yet loftier, when they were at that mysterious feast—if not the Eucharist itself, yet that in every Christian meal which is symbolical of it. He made Himself 'known to them in the Breaking of the Bread.' We ask, how? Some of old touchingly thought by the marks in the Hands. What if it were that voice, so majestic even in its moments of utmost familiarity and when it pronounced the most homely words; yet so magnetic that it drew Peter through the water?

What we have been writing is no mere matter of spiritualizing sentiment. It bears—and as we conceive, bears irresistibly—upon that theory to account for the Resurrection which, on the whole, is most widely received in anti-Christian circles.

The coarse old theory Paley refuted, with his admirable but absolutely unoriginal common-sense—the vulgar invention of the chief priests and elders. It is now blown into space.

But the radiant, lasting, ineradicable joy of the disciples disposes of the further after-thought of later criticism—'He did not die; He was taken down alive from the Cross.' This is refuted by two great arguments: (1) By the accurate physiological observations of St. John,⁵ which absolutely prove actual death. (2) Above all, by the character of the

ο γὰρ

 $^{^{1}}$ Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρα μορφ \hat{y} (St. Mark xvi. 12).

² ως εγνωσθη αὐτοῖς εν τῆ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου (St. Luke xxiv. 35).

³ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε. οὐδεῖς ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν, Σὺ τίς εἶ; (St. John xxi. 12).

⁴ ξβαλεν ἐαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (St. John xxi. 7). How lovely is Bengel's brief note—'citius nando, quam navi, perventurus ad Dominum.' Compare St. Matt. viv. 28. 'her javes et undes trabit amor Iesu.'

pare St. Matt. xiv. 28—'per ignes et undas trahit amor Jesu.'

St. John xix. 34, xx. 20. The remarkable Paper of the Rev. S. Haughton, M.D., on the physical cause of the death of Christ, contritributed by that eminent physiologist to the Speaker's Commentary
(N. T. iv. 349, 350), is far in advance of Dr. Stroud's discussion of the
same subject, and has met with too little attention.

18

si

SI

V

tl

ir

0

SI

ir

0

C

li

re

d

u

n

E

r

d

Redeemer. The Holy One would never have condescended to accept worship founded upon a great mistake; nor would He have been holy had He done so.

But our present argument supplies another, and morally convincing, argument.

Supposing He had not died, but had been taken down in a death-like swoon from the Cross, and recovered by the coolness of the sepulchre, and by the pungency of the spices—what appearance must He have presented?

Only some forty hours unfastened from the torture of the Cross; His limbs punctured, His back torn by the merciless Roman scourge, His wounds unstaunched; lacerated, faint, weary, broken with shame and suffering; a lamed, feverish, spectral, skulking thing!—could that have seemed the Risen Lord, who said, 'I am the living, and I became dead; and behold! I am living unto the ages of the ages'?¹ Those who saw him in Gethsemane and on the Cross, and again upon Easter-day, cannot speak of the Resurrection without a burst of almost lyrical enthusiasm. We have quoted St. John. St. Peter says, 'Blessed be the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.' Their faith is rooted in the Resurrection. Their joy is a blossom coloured with the summer of its touch.²

We regret that Père Didon has not developed an argument so terribly needed in France.³

¹ Καὶ ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (Apoc. i. 18).

² Very striking too is the enthusiasm of one who, without himself seeing it, caught the flame from those in whom it was kindled by the voice and sight of the Risen Jesus. The frail mould of human language seems to be cracked and splintered by the intensity of intellectual and spiritual force with which it is charged and overcharged, e.g. Τὸ ὑπερ-βάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (Ephes. i. 19). 'It was indeed an excessive grandeur of power, an energy of the might of strength, as the apostle laboureth to express the unexpressible eminency of this miracle' (Barrow On the Creed).

s'It is but justice to our author to add that, on the other theory which attempts to account for the belief in the Resurrection, Père Didon has an admirable page, ending with these weighty and original sentences: 'The point is to give some fairly rational account of such a state' [as that of the Apostles]. 'To invoke their ardent love, the mirage of Oriental light, the springtime of Galilee, its dazzling sky, is simply to make oneself ridiculous to those who really know Orientals and the subtleties, the simple craft of their incredulity. The Jew and the Arab never dream day-dreams. No people on earth have less of the sentiment of nature, and are, consequently, less accessible to that refined exaltation which can only be experienced by a modern imaginative creature. Besides, we must not forget that the world was conquered to the faith by these men who

July

nded

ould

rally

n in

pices

re of

iercifaint,

erish, Risen

and hose

again out a

John.

Lord

by

faith

oured

argu-

αἰώνων

imself by the

nguage

lσχύος ver, an

ess the

which has an 'The

of the

ht, the

culous raft of

. No

conse-

st not n who III. To that which has been observed upon or quoted from Père Didon, we are here tempted to add some considerations upon a subject of the utmost importance for the right understanding of the life of Jesus in the Gospels. The subject to which we refer has not escaped our author's observation. But it deserves a fuller and more serious treatment than it has as yet anywhere received. We refer to the Leading Ideas of the Gospels.

Viewed from their human and literary side, the Gospels may be defined as 'informal memoirs' of the earthly life of our Lord Jesus Christ, written from and pervaded by certain great Leading Ideas. Indeed, a consideration of their character and purpose will show that no other conception is possible. For there are two things which the Gospels assuredly

are no

They are as far as possible from being regular biographies in the modern sense. They have neither consecutive fulness of detail, nor complete chronological exactitude. What is very important, they make no attempt at developing the gradual evolution of an unusual mind and career. They could not do this, the most interesting part of a great man's life, without coming into contact with the dogma which renders Christ's earthly career the most important part of the history of the human race. From hence it follows that to demand absolute completeness from an Evangelist is to misunderstand the very nature and condition of his work.

One important principle is involved in this.

We have no right to charge any Evangelist with ignorance of a fact, however important, because he may happen not to mention it articulately. Thus we are not warranted in asserting (with Renan) that St. John knew nothing of the birth in Bethlehem, or that the synoptic were unacquainted with the resurrection of Lazarus, because St. John does not distinctly record the one event, or because the three do not appear to refer to the other. The objection comes from critics who have forgotten, or who never possessed, the very definition of

preached a crucified and risen God. There is no instance of people in a state of hallucination conquering the world. All such beings are condemned to win nothing but compassion. To deny the Resurrection of Jesus is just to create another miracle—the foundation of Christianity by people under an hallucination' (tom. ii., liv. v., chap. xii. pp. 364, 365). This surely is quite admirable.

¹ To those who know the method of St. John's *irony*—stating as proof positive the very objection which to adversaries seemed fatal—St. John vii. 41, 42 will be decisive on the point of John's acquaintance

with the birth in Bethlehem.

₹891

to a

but

rigl

pre

as .

bea

eye

who

pre

rise

Per

Go

miz

insp

one

mu

ing

bei

rou

hea

the

the

fulf

acc

cath

and

spec

of (

had

toil,

bene

a Gospel. He who has no right to the premiss—'an Evangelist is to be put out of court who does not record every

important event '-has no right to its conclusion.

If the Gospels are not, on the one hand, regular biographies, neither, on the other hand, are they mere collections of pious anecdotes or great sayings strung together at random. There was lodged in the memory of the original Apostles and disciples a treasury of recollections. works, the discourses, the personality of Jesus Christ, were there in abundant fulness. As time passed, and a written record of those momentous years became necessary, the Evangelists selected such actions and sayings as brought out certain aspects of the Lord's ministry, purpose, character, and teaching. Each Gospel is arranged round one centre, or round a few central points or principles of selection. particular aspect, this grouping-point or principle of selection, is the Leading Idea of the Evangelist. The Gospels, then, are 'informal memoirs' of the earthly life of Jesus, pervaded by certain Leading Ideas.

Now in the Acts of the Apostles we find one most important evidence of the existence of these ideas, an original chapter of the Gospel history by the chief of its early witnesses. At least a quarter of a century before any of our present Gospels were committed to writing, apostolic thought and teaching upon the earthly life of the Saviour assumed that the whole

field was traversed by four principal ideas.

The fullest specimen of a 'primitive Gospel' which the Church now possesses is that which was spoken by St. Peter in his discourse to Cornelius and his company.' We there

find the four great lines of which we have spoken.

We may take St. Peter's words in the order most natural to us. (1) The Saviour whom the Apostle preached was the Messiah attested by Hebrew prophecy. 'To Him give all the prophets witness.' (2) The earthly life of Jesus was a 'short, bright, resistless course '—resistless in the native charm of its enthusiastic benevolence. If brief in the measurement of time, it is permanent in its effect upon humanity. So far as its character from this point of view can be grasped in human language, it may be compressed into two words—'He passed through life doing good.' (3) But further. If the word, which God sent by Jesus Christ, was first sent to the children of Israel, it was also in its intrinsic character and tendency inevitably universal. Its ultimate address was not

Acts x. 34-44.
 Διῆλθεν εὖεργετῶν (Acts x. 38).

July

npor-

ginal

esses.

spels

ching

whole

1 the

Peter

there

itural

is the

ll the

short,

of its

far as

uman

assed

word, chil-

and

is not

to a race, but to a world. 'God is no respecter of persons; vanbut in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh very righteousness is accepted by Him.' He by whom peace is preached to the children of Israel is also 'Lord of all.' And bioas His message is universal, so His is the moral and spiritual ollecbeauty, the divine unction, which attracts all men who have er at eyes to see; and His the power which is capable of healing the ginal whole diseased unspiritualized material of man's nature op-The pressed under the terrible dynasty of the accuser.² (4) Finally, were the Church wants to rest upon the foundation of all this; to itten rise to the source of the supernatural life of this marvellous van-Personality. Here we have the majestic theory of it—' for out God was with Him.' 3 These words may, of course, be miniacter. mized, or superficially understood. But, like other great re, or inspired utterances, they grow with the growth of the little This ones of God. Taken by themselves, they need not signify ction, much more than God's guidance of a specially favoured n, are servant; but they have in them the capacity of rising to the ed by inguiding and indwelling Word-to 'Emmanuel, which is,

being interpreted, God with us.'

Now, let it be observed that the four Gospels, moulded round their Leading Ideas, exactly fill in these summary headings of the primitive Gospel preached by St. Peter.

For Christ's life was many-sided. (1) It had its place as the historical continuation of the historical development of the purposes of God in Israel. Type and prophecy were fulfilled in Him. A great French poet has written of a dream of Boaz just before his marriage with Ruth. The account of the dream is perhaps prompted by some old cathedral window, but it embodies something of the spirit and purpose of the genealogy in St. Matthew.

⁴Then, in his dream, to heav'n, the blue and broad, Right from his loins an oak-tree grew amain. His race ran up it far like a long chain; Below it sang a king, above it died a God.'

St. Matthew's is the Gospel of consummated prophecy, specially addressed to the Hebrew race. (2) Again, the life of Christ, looked at from the side of its practical effects, had three salient characteristics. It was a life of unresting toil, of supernatural rapidity, of triumphant and enthusiastic benevolence. In appearance, it might appear at times to be

¹ Acts x. 34, 36.

Έχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς . . . ἰώμενος πάντας καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβολου (Acts x. 37, 38).

⁸ Acts x. 38.

189

SW

wit

har

pec

ear

ske

mu

sen

wit

lan

act

He

for

the

cha

adv

the

in t

ma

SO

fou

orig

tra

pre

and

his

Wo

my

exi

for

life

the

Soi

as

pov

Joh

nar

act

gra

eve

St.

by

feeble and isolated, baffled by the hardness and unbelief of man; in reality, it was strong with the strength of God. It wrought, in some true sense, even upon the masses by whom it seemed to be rejected. The very style of St. Mark bears the impress of these characteristics-of this pervading, everpresent purpose. Christ's toilful life, its rapid movements, its joyful love in working and suffering for stricken and fallen humanity are written as if by a hand which has had its fingers upon the Saviour's pulse, and has never since lost The opening invocation of 'In count of its beats. Memoriam' expresses this purpose of the Second Gospel in a single syllable—' Strong Son of God.' The first lines of St. Mark's record are, 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus. Christ, the Son of God.' It closes with the words: 'They went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word by the signs that followed.'2 (3) Further, the ministerial work of Jesus was a work of healing which needed to be recorded in some detail, that its certainty as a fact might not be lost in vague surprise. But there was a higher teaching still—that human life was a life of sweet sympathies and fruitful pardons, which opened out new possibilities to the penitent. It was a life lived by One who in presence of the ignorant and wandering maintained that exquisite equilibrium of feeling which was at once just and sweet, strong and gentle.' It had a special sympathy for the disinherited of earth, for the weak and poor; a special sense of their present disadvantages, and yet of their possible compensation. And, again, it was a life of beauty; over it was the movement of angels' wings and the music of angels' songs. Its spontaneous utterances were parables of forgiveness and words of tenderness; and the pages on which they were written are wetted with the

¹ Contrast Matt. xii. 58 with $\epsilon\theta a \dot{\nu} \mu a \dot{\nu} \epsilon \dot{\nu} \delta \dot{\alpha} \dot{\tau} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\nu} \dot{\alpha} m \iota \sigma \tau i a \nu a \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \dot{\nu}$ (Mark vi. 5, 6). The simple resources of the Evangelists' language are strained to express this divinely human self-limitation of Jesus—inasmuch as wonder is the result of ignorance, of suddenly realised disproportion between the conception and the event, a self-limitation of knowledge as well as of power.

² What a feeling of buoyant, helpful, continued strength there is in ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος. (St. Mark xvi. 20.)

³ Μετριοπαθείν δυνάμενος κ.τ.λ. (Heb. v. 2—a lovely summary of St. Luke's Gospel, traced, we venture to surmise, by the Evangelist's own hand.) Cf. the touching words about Jesus attributed to St. Paul in an ancient apocryphal document—"Os μόνος συνεπαθήσεν πλανωμένφ κόσμω, 'the only one who sympathised with a world that had lost its way,' Acta Pauli et Theclæ, 16. (Acta Apost. Apoc. 47. Edit. Tisch.)

lief of sweetest tears which human eyes have ever shed. It began d. It with the idyll of Bethlehem, and ended with the picture of whom hands, gentle and omnipotent, lifted up to bless. A pencil of bears peculiar aptitude was needed to render these aspects of the , everearthly life of Jesus. He who can worthily fill up this nts, its sketch must not only have deep love for its subject-hefallen must be a physician. He must also be endowed with æsthetic ad its sensibility. He must, moreover, be a psychologist. He must e lost with delicate instinct perceive, and with sufficient range of f 'In language express, how this great Messenger of eternal love pel in acted upon different leading types of human character; how He was received by woman, at that time despised and half forgotten, alike by Jew and Gentile. And in tracing out these dealings with almost every type and form of human character and feeling, a Gospel must be written fit for the advancing footsteps of a faith which was addressing itself to the conquest of the world. Such an instrument was found in the third Evangelist. (4) Finally, a life so various and But many-sided, a life so mysteriously beautiful, yet with claims so lofty, so exacting, so assertive, so imperative, will be found to need a clue to its interpretation, a theory of its origin which shall sufficiently harmonise its apparently contradictory phenomena. This it is with which we are presented by St. John repeatedly in the course of the utterances preserved by him-most markedly in the Prologue of his Gospel, and in the great witness at its conclusion—'The Word was God; and the Word became Flesh. My Lord and my God.'

Thus in St. Matthew's Gospel we have Christ's earthly existence as a life freely moulding itself in a predesignated form; in St. Mark as a strong life; in St. Luke as a tender life; in St. John as literally a divine life, the life of God humanified, lived under human limitations and conditions. In the first we see Jesus as the Messiah, in the second as the Son of God, in the third as the Son of Man, in the fourth as the God-Man. With St. Matthew the chief factor is the conception of prophecy, with St. Mark the conception of power, with St. Luke the conception of beauty, with St. John the conception of divinity. In the first the predominant elements are fulfilment and sacrifice; in the second action and conquest; in the third forgiveness and universal grace; in the fourth idealism and dogma. St. Matthew will ever appeal most powerfully to the Old Testament scholar; St. Mark to the ecclesiastical organizer, to him who is attracted by the outward things of Christ; while St. Luke has a voice

nes of Jesus They g with wed.' 2 ork of hat its s a life ed out y One ntained ce just sympoor; yet of life of nd the s were nd the

Mark vi. ained to wonder ween the ell as of ere is in

th the

αιούντος. mary of

angelist's St. Paul **\ανωμένφ** lost its Tisch.)

of charm for the tender and imaginative, and St. John supplies the chosen food of the mystic and sacramental instinct. If we look round Christendom we shall find more of one Evangelist than of another in each of its tendencies and creations. St. Matthew must always be our guide through the Hebrew porch of the Church; St. Mark's spirit is with those who have fitted outward symbols to the Church's organic life as expressive of inward ideas; St. Luke has the largest part in the galleries of sacred art, in the utterances of Christian poets, in the austere joys of canticles and liturgies, with missionaries, with workers in hospitals, with those who are devoted to the service of poverty and the help of penitents; St. John has the largest share in the vast volume of dogmatic theology. From him principally faith learns the mystery of the new birth of water and of the Spirit, the sweet and awful secret of the sacramental Presence.1

The memorable passage in the beginning of Ezekiel's prophecy seems to be not without reference to the characteristic and Leading Ideas, to the four constituents of the fourfold Gospel. All that most truly lives is here by representation. The ox is the emblem of toil and of sacrifice—of patient, suffering, bleeding life. The lion is strong, royal, victorious. The eagle soars upwards in spires, rising and falling with no apparent effort; gliding over the highest mountains and lost in the azure distance, apparently in the heaven itself. above these three highest specimens of forms of animal life man comes, who blends in one, and carries into a higher sphere, all those endowments which they possess in some measure in fact, perfectly in the conception of gifted souls. Man alone is capable of sacrifice in its one true form, selfsacrifice; man alone is capable of the only conquests that are noble, of the only ideas which elevate to heaven. The great conception of three of the cherubic symbols, the ox, the lion, and the eagle-of suffering, action, thought-find their perfection in the truly human life and nature which is symbolical of the man.2

1891

nati

stam

and

¹ We are here under large obligations to Lange, *Life of Christ*, i. 196-221 (Engl. Trans.). Note that the First Epistle of St. John contains a synoptical analysis of one of the Leading Ideas of the Gospel—that of witness (1 John v. 6-10). See the Bishop of Derry's *Epistles of St. John* (pp. 23, 30-36, 38).

⁽pp. 23, 30-36, 38).

The old rabbinical saying was—'quatuor sunt qui principatum in hoc mundo tenent—inter creaturas homo, inter aves aquila, inter pecora bos, inter bestias leo.' (Schernoth Rabba. Schöttgen, Horæ Hebr. 1168.) 'Quaternis faciebus eximiæ vires atque facultates significantur, cherubis a Deo ad munus suum sustinendum impertitæ' (Ed. C. August. Brehm De Natura et Notione symbolica Cherub. pp. 21 sqq.).

July

John

nental

ore of

es and

rough

s with

rganic

argest

Chris-

s, with

ho are

itents;

gmatic

tery of

et and

zekiel's

racter-

ourfold

tation.

nt, suf-

orious.

vith no

nd lost

And

mal life

higher

n some

d souls.

m, self-

that are

ne great

he lion,

eir per-

nbolical

st, i. 196-

ontains a

that of St. John

ipatum in

er pecora

br. 1168.) cherubis

t. Brehm

It may be asked *how* we connect this with the Gospels, and the cherubic symbols with the Evangelists?

God appears to the prophet in human form. The canopy on which His throne is fixed is lowered to the earth. The cherubim are seen, the sure sign of God's dwelling with His people. They are no visionary symbols. They are real, living with an intense reality. They plant their feet upon the ground. The wonderful wheel beside each cherub does not move through the air, but upon the earth. For God comes down and dwells visibly among men. His Presence is not confined to one place or one temple. He goes forth among the nations which are represented by the fourfold form of the cherubim and the wheels, four being the prophetic number of catholicity. God's glory makes its progress from Israel to the nations. The throne is His car. 'The likeness as the appearance of a man above it,'1 is not man deified, but God humanified in the Incarnation. To the spirit of the Christian Church this is the religion and truth of Jesus Christ; and the religion and worship of Jesus Christ has gone abroad by the Gospels,2 which thus possess certain of the characteristics symbolized by the cherubim as manifested to the prophet.

This interpretation is often stigmatized as a childish play of fancy. Certain it is, however, that from the beginning it has been a favourite of Christian thought. When the interpretation was revived at Oxford some forty-five years ago, it was branded by many as a mystic dream. Since that time, however, the passage has been profoundly studied; and modern sacred science among believing critics in Germany, as elsewhere, tends to accept the view as undeniably well founded. No doubt among early Christian writers there were childlike or childish guesses at the particulars of the symbols. The prevalent interpretation of Biblical scholars tends to the following distinction. The ox is the symbol of sacrifice, and stamps the Gospel of St. Matthew; the lion represents strength and victory, and suits the Gospel of St. Mark; the man refers to the human sympathy and the salvation offered to universal

It is, however, to be borne in mind that representations of abstract ideas as living things really lie outside the region of biblical symbolism. The cherubim are angelic beings of an exalted order (Ezek. xxviii. 14–16). 'The gates of Eden were not kept by ideal conceptions (Gen. iii. 24).' But this does not affect the fact that the conception of these living realities is best conveyed to us by certain symbolical expressions.

¹ Ezek. i. 16.

² 'Has Domini sacras quadrigas quibus per orbem vectus subigit populos leni suo jugo et sarcinæ levi' (St. August. Lib. de Consen. Evang. i. 7).

I

h

t

tl

0

n

W

di

M

is

er

re (ii

ca

sa

sp

ju Je

in

be

sp

Wi

Je

sty

po

radis

i. I

pp.

humanity, and therefore accords with St. Luke. Heavenly aspirations and thoughts elevated by the dogma of dogmas to the divinity of Jesus Christ claim for themselves the symbol of the eagle, and belong to St. John.

If there are any readers to whom this interpretation appears to dwell in a region of which they are upon principle suspicious they will at least allow that one consideration of importance follows from it—the early and almost universal acceptance of the application (if we will not allow the term interpretation) of prophecy proves at least that the line of thought upon which it was based commended itself to ancient Christianity. The conception of Leading Ideas, answering to mental characteristics of the four Evangelists, was one with which they felt at home, and which, if not created by the symbols of Ezekiel, at least naturally expressed itself by them. If the symbol did not create the conception, the conception availed itself of the symbol.

We must guard this argument by an important reservation from an extravagant amount of application, as well as from unfair and malignant inferences. We may close this argument with an analogy and with a practical remark.

In the biographies of remarkable men, who touch the circumference of human life at more points than one, we may find some analogy to different gospels, written from different Leading Ideas.

Of Socrates (who, in this like our Lord, left no writings behind him) we have representation in the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon and in the Dialogues of Plato. Of these, as has often been remarked, the first corresponds in its way to the synoptics, the second to the loftier and more ideal conceptions of St. John. But everyone feels that Plato is not falsified by Xenophon, nor Xenophon by Plato; much less is the august figure of Socrates relegated to the land of shadows by the different representations of the reporters. We combine the two images and get a *generalized photograph*, better and truer than either separately.

Again, Archbishop Laud, as a statesman and great ecclesiastical politician, found a congenial biographer in Heylin. But the deeper spiritual life, the almost awful intensity of penitential self-abasement, so touchingly manifested in the Archbishop's Diary and in his dying speech, has found no biographer. Heylin has never touched that with one of his fingers. His Leading Idea was that of the statesman-primate, and all that lay outside was totally omitted by him. The life of Laud lay in two spheres, and Heylin has only set him forth in one of

eavenly gmas to symbol

July

retation or inciple ration of iniversal term inthought the Christering to one with by them. nception

servation l as from rgument

the cirwe may different writings

vabilia of se, as has ay to the nceptions t falsified ess is the adows by combine petter and

at ecclesiylin. But benitential chbishop's iographer. gers. His id all that Laud lay in one of the two. If any man thinks it right to be just, even to Laud, he will supplement the Leading Idea of Heylin by what was evidently the Leading Idea of Laud himself, and no doubt of the few whom Laud admitted into the sanctuary of his soul.

The practical remark which we offer is this.

A life constructed according to Leading Ideas must necessarily assume the character of an 'informal memoir;' and this, as has been most truly remarked, best preserves and continues the impression of a great personality. As a matter of fact we have not one perfect and unbroken record of the earthly life of Jesus, but four different 'projections,' four different 'photographs,' which each individual soul has to reproduce for itself.² The image which we receive from them is verified and made luminous for us by another influence. The same spirit which lay behind and below the one great production of each Gospel lies behind and below each partial and individual production of it. 'He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you.'3 One thing is certain. It is not by their style that the four gospels do their work-not even St. Luke's Gospel, with its undeniable superiority in this respect. It has been repeatedly said of late that the gospels (in common with other parts of Scripture) enjoy what may be called an unfair advantage in the simple majesty and noble rhythm of our English Authorized Version. But it cannot be said that all other languages have been in a spontaneous conspiracy to elevate the Sacred Books beyond their proper level in the opinion of civilized humanity. Yet, as far as one can judge, no fainter impression of the work and character of Jesus Christ is made upon the people of other lands by their inferior versions. The majesty and beauty of the Man is not a sum-total proportioned to the sum-total of the majesty and beauty of the style in which His earthly life is described. The spiritual nobility of the first is absolutely incommensurable with the intellectual nobility of the second. It is the image of Jesus which tinges, which radiates through, the wrappings of style, as the sunset through a swathe of clouds. Infinite love and wisdom struggle through words, which, not seldom, are poor and broken enough. It is not human genius masquerading, playing at Divinity in divinely beautiful language. It is Divinity condescending to veil itself partially in ordinary

³ St. John xvi. 14.

^{1 &#}x27;The "homo interior" was not in Heylin's line.'—Mozley, Essays,

i. 109.

² See the excellent passage in Mr. Latham's Pastor Pastorum, pp. 16-18.

18

CC

of

H

th

of

go

ro

an

Id

he

wi

Bu

to

tio

pro

ma

Bu

sor

and

cel

SVI

wh

eac

nan

'th

bor

kno

tho

'Th

'the

as a

by t

and

n. 4,

X. 20

i. 35-

Evar

speech for its own high ends. Our belief in the truth of the narrative is more entire when it is told with such sacred negligence of rhetorical and literary embellishment. In the gospels Christ comes to us and we may go to Him almost as in His Sacraments. In the great words of the old martyr whose broken Greek has sometimes such singular power—'we fly for refuge to the gospel as to the flesh of Jesus.' 1

To the Leading Ideas of the four gospels we owe the shape which they have assumed; and to the four gospels, partly in spite of, partly on account of, their style, we owe our knowledge of Legus Christ

A serious caution, however, is needed against an erroneous impression which may be derived from an unbalanced and one-sided presentation of what has just been maintained.

It may be argued, with something more than plausibility, that the conception of Leading Ideas in the Gospels tends to make them controversial essays rather than genuine memoirs. A life handled by a biographer possessed by a Leading Idea might be distorted into a controversial pamphlet or even into an imaginative romance.

It is, however, to be noticed that a distinction should be drawn between the Leading Ideas of a book in regard to its complexion and colouring of sentiment on one hand, and its narrative on the other; between its cast of thought and its record of facts. To revert to a previous historical illustration, Heylin has his leading idea of Laud as an ecclesiastical statesman. One who knew Laud's inner life with an equal degree of intimacy would regard it from another and more spiritual point of view, as a life of penitence and prayer. both views would be something better than metaphysical armies of Queen Entelecheia, with their bases in the air of speculation; they would both stand upon the solid ground of the facts of history. The statesman will at times wear the sombre aspect of the penitent, and look upward with a prayer upon his lips; the penitent will at times feel it his duty to speak with the masculine and haughty accents of a Prince of the Church. The statesman fact and the penitent fact would not only subsist side by side, but interpenetrate each other. The subjectivity of the writer of a complex life does not create the facts which he has to record, if he is a serious and

¹ Προσφυγών τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ (Ignat. Epist. ad Philipp. v.). For other passages where εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγέλια are used for written memoirs of the life of Christ in very early times see Justin M. Apolog. i. 66; Dialog. c. Tryph. C. 227, B. 328. See also Bishop Lightfoot's Apostolic Fathers, ii. 260-2.

In the nost as martyr — we shape

July

of the

sacred

wledge oneous ed and ed.

rtly in

sibility, tends enuine by a mphlet

ould be d to its and its and its tration, siastical n equal d more r. But armies lation; ne facts sombre er upon speak of the

would h other. loes not ous and

hilipp. v.). ritten melog. i. 66; Apostolic conscientious historian; but the facts create the subjectivity. Thus, at the beginning of the gospel narrative, the Hebraizing Gospel of St. Matthew, and it alone, tells of the first-fruits of the Gentile world coming to the new-born King. The Hellenizing Gospel of the Gentiles, and it alone, shows how the whole history of the Incarnation comes out, like a glimpse of heaven, from the incense-cloud of the temple. The same gospel, and it alone, preserves the mention of the Davidic royalty of Mary's Son. The circumcision of the Saviour as an Israelite; His presentation in the temple; His mother's purification and offering, are in St. Luke alone. The Leading Idea of an evangelist forms for him a path through which he passes to his goal—which guides him through what otherwise might be a wilderness of isolated and disconnected facts. But he is not oblivious of the country to his right hand and to his left.1

It may further be noted that any unhistorical exaggeration of the theory of Leading Ideas is provided for by the old prophetic symbols. The fourfold gospel is one. Christ's life may be told with predominating peculiarities in each gospel. But in each is something of the ox, something of the lion, something of the man, something of the eagle. The wounds and sacrifice, the fulfilled type, the completed prophecy, the celerity and enthusiasm of the conqueror, the tenderness, the sympathy, the tears, the beauty of the man-these are somewhere in each gospel, and not concentrated in one only. In each also is the eagle's sunward flight. 'They shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us;' 'therefore came I forth;' that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God;' 'no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father '2-these words and thoughts are natives of the same lofty and ample region as 'The Word was God,' or 'I and My Father are One.' Truly 'they four also have the face of an eagle!'

We may take one incident common to all the Evangelists as a specimen of the way in which the narratives were moulded by their Leading Ideas—the call of Simon and Andrew, James and John 4—(1) St. Matthew records this very briefly, appa-

 $^{^{1}}$ See especially Dr. Mill's Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, 172, $n.\ 4$, and note at end of the chapter.

³ St. Matt. i. 23; St. Mark i. 38; St. Luke i. 35, x. 22; St. John i. 1, 6, 20.

³ Ezek. i. 10.

⁴ St. Matt. iv. 18-23, St. Mark i. 16-21, St. Luke v. 1-12; cf. St. John i. 35-43. We speak for convenience of the incident as common to all the Evangelists; though, of course, St. John's account is, strictly speaking, VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

]

i

iı

C

re

al

d

la

pi

be

to

th

es

G

Je

SC

In

to

in

rec

ler

Pè

up

els

Jes wh

rently mainly as the fulfilment of a prophecy of Isaiah. (2) St. Mark's notice is also short. To him the conversions present themselves as noble instances of the attraction of grace, of the resistless magic of that voice.2 Nothing is impossible with God. Yet that two brothers should simultaneously obey a call which involved so much self-sacrifice is no ordinary event. But that another pair of brothers should do so, and leap at the same moment over a mental and moral chasm so vast. constitutes a complex improbability which the ingenuity of a mathematician has set itself to state in the terms of his science.3 The modern critical and historical spirit is tempted to see primâ facie indications of the iteration so commonly characteristic of the legends of the most different countries. St. Luke, with his keen moral tact, bridges over the chasm by supplying the psychological antecedents of the cases, which, stated barely, might seem strange and even suspicious. There was a previous connexion between the pairs of brothers and the Master, as there were business ties between Simon and Andrew, John and James. All four had previously heard some of that great teaching and been brought near to that marvellous personality. They had seen a miracle just of the character to impress minds like theirs. Simon Peter felt the spiritual awe of a decisive beginning, of a resolve which had been slowly maturing, and which was now brought to full ripeness by the fierce light of the spiritual world thrown upon it in a few moments.5 St. John (one of whose leading ideas is the instinctive craving for historical actuality which balances his unquestionable idealism) clears the way still further. One of the pair of fisher-brothers—intimate and in practical relations with the other-were disciples of long standing. Jesus had long before looked into the very depths of Simon's being with that penetrating and attractive glance.6 The call, which had been long prepared for, possibly more than half expected,

not of the call itself, but of the preparation for it in the case of Andrew and Simon.

¹ St. Matt. iv. 14-22. ² St. Mark i. 16-20.

³ See the ingenious statement of Mr. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 196-202.

4 'James and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon' (St. Luke v. 10).

b But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken: and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.' (St. Luke v. 8-11).

6 Έμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, κ.τ.λ. (St. John i. 43).

(2) St. present e, of the ole with obey a y event. leap at so vast, ity of a science.3 d to see characes. But e chasm s, which, . There hers and non and ly heard to that st of the r felt the hich had t to full wn upon ing ideas balances er. One tical relag. Jesus on's being call, which

expected, of Andrew

storum, pp.

artners with nees, saying, was amazed,

was amazed, ch they had which were from hencecame at last. All the narratives are perfectly true. No one is in any way inconsistent with the others. But the first two Evangelists redacted their gospels when much was fresh in the memory of the Church, which was taken for granted and did not need to be written. St. Luke fills in the particulars, and St. John supplies a solid substratum in the earlier part of the evangelical story. For St. Matthew the obedience of the brethren to a call of such momentous import was, indeed, one individual and most beautiful illustration of the prophetic announcement of the 'great light' which was to 'spring up' from Galilee of the Gentiles. For St. Mark the incident was another proof of the magnetic and triumphant sweetness, the victrix delectatio which the Conqueror of hearts communicated instantaneously 1 to the wills of men. St. Luke, the psychological Evangelist, indicates that in this, as in all other circumstances, no inch of human nature lies outside the reign of law; that the spark of heavenly grace in this case also set fire to materials previously provided. St. John, with no immediate view to an apologetic handling of this incident-simply from his historical tendency and purpose-has laid a strong foundation of fact under the statements of his predecessors. To us this seems an interesting example of the benefit which arises from a judicious use of the conception of Leading Ideas.

We have now completed a task which has been delightful to us. We have first indicated what seems to us to constitute the great strength of Père Didon's work. We have instanced especially his general conception of the position of the Gospels in the Church; of the Personality and origin of Jesus Christ; his living grasp of the very quintessence of scientific dogma. Whatever is said by Aquinas upon the Incarnation lives in Didon. Our longest extract has been from the chapter upon the Temptation. We have ventured to note a certain falling off, a something jejune and unfinished, in the very important departments of the Death and Resurrection. And we have been bold enough to enter at some length upon two particular points where, to our thinking, Père Didon has not only written thinly and almost feebly upon most affecting and important words and facts, but failed to draw the lessons which were most needed in France and elsewhere. We refer to the disproof of the hypotheses that Jesus despaired of His mission, and that He was not dead when He was taken down from the cross. And, in dis-

1 Εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν (St. Mark i. 18).

d

it

re

us

ar

sta

ple

OV

co

ve

de

wh

be

pai

cussing the walk of the disciples to Emmaus, we have, further, expressed an opinion that our author might profitably have carried the ancient conception of Leading Ideas in the gospels into considerably more detail. Finally, we press for a diligent revisal of the references, which are at once very defective and very inaccurate, and for a full and careful Index. We are inclined to believe that the maps of Jerusalem and of Palestine are good, and that the chronological table of facts in the life of Jesus, with its references to the Evangelists and to their work, in some degree supplies, though it does not supersede, an Index. But we are not in a position to speak positively on these points.

We trust that we have not spoken unbecomingly or ungratefully of a book for which we feel something higher than profound admiration. No thoughtful man can read it without understanding Christ a little better, and loving Him a little more. In that great Presence the lofty spirit of the author has bathed itself in an atmosphere of peace, and risen above the controversies of a divided Christendom. Were we to quote all the passages over which we have lingered in delight our article would swell into a volume. We conclude our task regretfully with the beautiful close of the Introduction.²

'I know that people have multiplied misunderstandings between the Christ of the faith and cultivated intellects of the day. Perhaps this work may be fortunate enough to dissipate some of these. It has been written in solitude and silence, far from that which divides men. It is the fruit of long and persevering labour—I might say of all my life. It is not the agitated work of polemical passion, but the tranquil work of history, the work of faith. In writing the Master's life it has seemed to me that His beauty, His sweetness, His wisdom, His holiness, His love, the divinity radiating through His words, His acts, His sufferings, would defend Him better than our weak arguments and our vain angers. I would that something of Him—a breath of His soul and His spirit—may have passed into these pages. I would that I could communicate to all that which He has given to me.

¹ App. v. tom. ii. pp. 448-466.

² We must indulge ourselves by citing a few sentences upon the style and character of the Gospels. ⁴ We cannot catch in the Gospels the expression of the inner sentiments which filled these writers in painting their Master's life. There is no enthusiasm, no cry of admiration, no reflection of their own. They recollect; that is all. And they write their recollections as the Spirit suggests them, or as other witnesses enable them to state those recollections with greater precision. This is the secret of the beauty, of the simplicity, of the sanctity, of the undying force of the Gospels. It is not the soul, the mind, the genius of their Hero.³ (Introd. xxx—xxxiii.)

further, oly have in the ve press nce very careful of Jerunological s to the supplies, not in a

July

y or unher than without n a little e author en above e we to n delight ude our uction.2

s between Perhaps these. It ch divides ght say of n, but the Master's s wisdom, lis words, our weak f Him-a nto these h He has

n the style ospels the n painting ration, no write their ses enable his is the lying force he writers he genius

'In spite of all, Jesus remains the great figure in the heaven of Christian populations. Justice, quickened by love such as He willed to exist, has become the sovereign law of the world; it binds all consciences, and even those who have lost faith in Christ preserve His morality, while forgetting that it comes from Him. The power of self-sacrifice-that lever which Jesus placed in the hands of His disciples-is unfailing. True believers are always ready to give their life, that humanity, to the least and lowest of its children, may be saved from evil, from ignorance, from pain, and from death.

'Towards Christ, such as the Church receives Him, I would draw the eyes of this generation. It is called sick; He will cure It is called old and spent; He will give it back the time when it was twenty and its lofty charm, for His disciple always remains a man of eternal hope. Our generation is accused of being "positive," of believing in nothing but the palpable and visible, the useful and pleasant. He will teach it to see the invisible, to realise the immaterial, to understand that the man most serviceable to himself and to others, to his country and humanity, is the man who understands immolation, and that the most refined of all enjoyments is the sacrifice of self. Our generation, again, is said to be wildly set upon pleasure and money. Perhaps this is the reason of its decline; for pleasure kills, and money may lead to all vices. But Christ will teach it to disdain mere pleasure, and to spend rightly the riches which overflow in larger measure in proportion as the earth is more wisely conquered.

'In any case, the world remains a prey to a thousand pains and Those who most loudly vaunt the joy of living know very well that this joy is of a terribly mingled character, and that death is more cruel in exact proportion to the happiness of the life which it crushes. It is Christ alone who teaches the joy of suffering, because it is He alone who pours into the soul a divine life which no pain can overwhelm, which trial only strengthens, and which can despise death, because it permits us to face death with the fulness of

immortal hope.' 2

¹ 'Il lui rendra ses vingts ans.' ² Introd. lxxxvii, lxxxviii.

st

tl

fi

ART. II.—THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

- The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years, 1833-1845. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., sometime Dean of St. Paul's, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London, 1891.)
- 2. Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman, duringhis Life in the English Church. With a Brief Autobiography, edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. In Two Volumes. (London, 1891.)

SUCH a work as that which the late Dean of St. Paul's has bequeathed to us was a real desideratum in ecclesiastical history. It is true, as he remarks in his Preface, that much has been already written upon the subject. The Narrative of Mr. Palmer, the Collections of Mr. Perceval, the Apologia of Cardinal Newman, the Twelve Good Men of Dean Burgon, the Reminiscences of Mr. T. Mozley, the Short Studies of Mr. J. A. Froude, the Biographies of Mr. J. Keble, Mr. Ward, and others, to say nothing of innumerable essays, sketches, and pamphlets, may cover, more or less, the same ground; but it is no disrespect to any of them to say that they yet leave ample room for such a work as that of Dean Church, who combines, in a unique degree, the qualifications requisite for his delicate task. A pure and refined literary style, equal to Newman's own; a judicial mind which always prevents the warm sympathy which he avowedly had with the movement from degenerating into mere partizanship; a thorough knowledge of all the ins and outs of the complications of its earlier phases; a personal acquaintance with the chief actors; a perfect taste which guides him instinctively as to what should be told and what left untold; a happy mixture of outspokenness which prevents him from so qualifying and watering down his statements that they lose their force, and of complete self-control which guards him from ever being carried away by his feelings; these are the qualities which, combined with the true courtesy of the Christian gentleman, render him the almost ideal historian of a movement which, in its results, has well-nigh revolutionized the Church of England. With characteristic modesty he describes his object as being 'simply to preserve a contemporary memorial of what seems to me to have been a true and noble effort which passed before my eyes, a short scene of religious earnestness and aspiration, with all that was in it of self-devotion, affectionateness, and high

By of St. ondon.

during tobio-ANNE

l's has astical much rrative ogia of urgon, of Mr. d, and es, and but it leave h, who ite for ual to its the rement knowearlier ors; a should pokenatering f comcarried nbined er him results,

With

simply

to me ore my

n, with

d high

and refined and varied character, displayed under circumstances which are scarcely intelligible to men of the present time.' In this object he has assuredly succeeded; and it is one of the special charms of his work that it is the product of one who was not only an eye-witness, but also an important factor in the movement. But he has also done much more than this; he has given us, what he disclaims attempting to give, a philosophical history which may be amplified, but, from the nature of the case, can never be superseded by any future writer; for the contemporaries of the movement are fast dying out, and it would be sanguine indeed to hope that any one will arise who can compensate for the advantages which a personal knowledge gives, by greater literary power

than this great literary artist possessed.

In saying all this, which is surely no more than ought to be said, it is not meant that we are prepared to follow even Dean Church blindly whithersoever he may lead us. In some points we should certainly venture, though with great diffidence, to differ from one who was so high an authority in every way. For instance, we are inclined to take a higher estimate of Isaac Williams' poetry than he has done (see p. 68): and we hardly think that 'MS. Memoir' (p. 58) is quite an adequate description of what is really a most valuable and interesting chapter of autobiography by Mr. Williams, which, we earnestly hope, will some time or other be given to the public, and not left merely for the perusal of private friends. Again, our recollection of the saintly and learned Charles Marriott would scarcely lead us to endorse Dean Church's description of his 'uncouth exterior' (p. 73); and we should demur to the suggestion which the Dean makes tentatively, that Alexander Knox may have been influenced in his Church views by his intimacy with John Wesley (p. 128). From a long study both of Knox and Wesley we are convinced that, as a thinker, Knox was a far stronger man than Wesley: and it requires very clear proof, which in this case is not forthcoming, to show that the stronger was influenced by the weaker. And once more, in the account of the famous contest for the Poetry Professorship in 1841-2, the Dean appears to us to exaggerate the claims of Mr. Garbett (pp. 274-6); though this is one instance out of many of his desire to be scrupulously fair all round, for of course his own sympathies would be all in favour of Mr. Williams. But these are merely secondary points, hardly affecting in

¹ Letter to Lord Acton quoted in the Advertisement to this volume, p. vi.

br

pr

di

ou

lo

th

w

of

to

st

pr

re

m

le

in

st

to

tı

W

te

d

n

tl

any appreciable degree at all the value of the work, which is far away the best account that has been, or probably ever will be, written of the first twelve years of the Oxford Movement.

Curiously enough, the very same year which gives to the world Dean Church's History gives to it also Cardinal Newman's Letters and Correspondence up to the time of his secession to Rome; that is, up to the time at which the Dean's account also closes. So we have almost simultaneously, from two of the greatest masters of the English language which the present century has produced, separate accounts of the events which have been beyond all comparison the most important events in English Church history for many a long day. The writers are quite independent witnesses: Church did not see what Newman, nor Newman what Church, wrote, but there is no substantial discrepancy between them; in almost every instance what one says the other confirms. The two together, therefore, furnish an excellent basis for forming a right estimate of an episode in the chequered life of our Church, the interest in which is by no means exhausted, and the effects of which are now felt more deeply and widely than ever.

But before passing on to the general subject it may be remarked that the two volumes of Dr. Newman's Correspondence have an additional interest as illustrating his relationship to his own family. They give us, so to speak, a view of Cicero from the standpoint of Arpinum; and it is a great satisfaction to find that the great Cardinal, unlike some great men, loses nothing by being, as it were, tracked home. One is sometimes tempted to extend the proverb, 'No man is a hero to his own valet,' and say, 'No man is a hero to his own family'; but these letters certainly do not warrant the extension in the case of Newman. On the contrary, they bring out most vividly his strong family feeling, and the affection, the confidence, the pride which they, and especially his mother, had in him. At the same time they emphasize the opinion we have always held that Newman never had a fair chance of doing justice to the full system of the English They show us that his home circle had really no idea of what it was; and to such a home-bird as Newman appears to have been this must have been a great drawback. What a difference it might have made if he had seen what Keble saw at Fairford and at Bisley! It will not, we trust, be any breach of confidence to say that if Keble ever for a moment became discouraged about the prospects of the which is oly ever Oxford

July

to the l News secesaccount two of he preevents portant The lid not te, but almost he two ming a of our ed, and

ly than

may be spondelationview of great e great . One is own the exy bring ection, lly his ize the d a fair English ally no ewman

wback.

n what

e trust,

for a

of the

English Church, the thought that that Church had trained and satisfied such saints as his own father and his own brother reassured him at once. Newman had nothing like this to fall back upon to strengthen his Churchmanship. To prevent misunderstanding, it should be added that the letters disclose nothing but what is good and kind and wise in the dealings of his family with him. But this only strengthens our position; the fact that his relations were deservedly loved and esteemed by him, while yet they could not sympathize with his peculiar views, would tell all the more against those views. We can read in these letters the old, old story, which has been repeated with variations in thousands of cases, of a young man, nursed in the lap of Evangelicalism, going to college and finding that the system would not bear the strain of the wider and deeper ideas, the ampler view of life, presented to him there. In how many instances has the result been a drifting away from the faith altogether! Newman's mind was of too religious a cast to suffer him to do this; and the influences brought to bear upon him when he left Trinity for Oriel, where the real change commenced, were not calculated to tempt him to do it; but the most powerful influence of all, that of Dr. Whately, would certainly lead him as far away in another direction from the principles he afterwards embraced as his old Evangelicalism would; though, strange as it may sound, it was Whately who first taught him to think rightly of the Church as a spiritual society. 'It was Whately who taught me,' he says, 'to rely upon myself'; Whately who, 'by teaching me to think, taught me to differ from himself' (i. 141). But we are now treading upon ground which has been made familiar to all by the Apologia. Before turning from these two fascinating volumes to our general subject, let it suffice to say that the Autobiographical Memoir, which fills about seventy pages of the first volume, is as interesting as the Apologia itself. Would that it had been continued throughout! But, in default of this, the editor has done her part admirably, both in the selection and arrangement of the letters, and in the connecting links which she has supplied with excellent taste and in a thoroughly good literary style.

And now to turn from the volumes before us to the great subject on which all three throw so much light. The first thing that strikes us is that they confirm the old impression that the Oxford Movement was the Oxford Movement—not, as it is becoming fashionable to say, a movement originating somewhere else, and from other men than the three or four

great Oxonians who until late years have always had the credit, and still more frequently the discredit, of having started it. Of course, in every movement there are predisposing causes; and this must be especially the case in a movement which aimed not at inculcating new, but simply at reviving old and almost forgotten truths. But if you begin tracing back such a movement to those who were, at most, its pioneers, you may never know where to stop. You may trace back and back, and show at last that the world rests on the back of the tortoise; but the question still remains, on what does the tortoise rest? So we may fully admit that that very acute thinker, Mr. Alexander Knox, anticipated many of the conclusions which were afterwards arrived at, and that he indoctrinated his admiring disciple Bishop Jebb, the appendix to whose Sermons may first have drawn general attention to the Vincentian canon; we may fully admit that Mr. Hugh James Rose made noble efforts as 'the restorer of the old paths,' and that his efforts ought to have been more successful than they actually were; we may fully admit that there was a wonderful suggestiveness in the fragmentary writings, and still more in the conversation, of that strange genius, S. T. Coleridge; and that he and, in a very different way, Sir Walter Scott and Bishop Percy did much to break up the fallow ground; we may fully admit that there was a large and compact body of excellent Churchmen, in the spiritual sense of the term, in the earlier years of the century, and that the names of Norris, Watson, Wordsworth, Daubeny, Sykes, Le Bas, Lyall, Van Mildert, Middleton, and to go a little farther back, Stevens, Horsley, Jones, Horne-where shall we stop? —ought never to be forgotten. We may also argue that some movement in the Church direction was inevitable, and that Oxford was the natural scene of it; for there the Evangelical party, which had, not altogether without reason, become identified in the public mind with all that was 'serious' in religion, was at a low ebb. We may agree that the times were ripe and ready for a change; that there was already a turn of the tide, and that the men who came to the front rose on the crest of the decuman wave. But still the fact remains that there was no general movement, in any intelligible sense of that term, until the Tracts appeared and the four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's began. Before that time there was no 'atmosphere in the public mind in which the voice of theology could be heard,' to adopt a happy phrase of Dean Church (p. 10); and the creators of this atmosphere were surely Newman, Pusey, and Keble. There was indeed at the outset.

323

1891

y of the it he inppendix ntion to . Hugh the old iccessful nere was ngs, and us, S. T.

nat very

up the arge and al sense that the ykes, Le e farther ve stop?

vay, Sir

nat some and that angelical me idenreligion,

vere ripe rn of the e on the ains that

sense of lock serwas no theology

n Church re surely he outset: a fourth who seemed likely to rank among the very foremost;

Ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra Esse sinent.

'That bright and beautiful Froude' lived long enough to give a stimulus both to Newman and Keble, and to bring them together, and then he was 'taken away from the evil to come' —if abuse and opposition are to be regarded as evil. So we may fairly take it that there were three general officers who led the campaign for restoring the old theology to its proper place, which was the real object of the Oxford Movement. It is difficult to say which is to be placed first among the three. Each contributed his share, without which the work could never have been done.

Keble sounded the first note in his famous Assize Sermon at Oxford in July 1833, and at the outset Keble was undoubtedly the foremost man. He was ten years senior in university standing to Newman and twelve to Pusey; and ten or a dozen years at Oxford count for more than twenty elsewhere. Though under thirty years of age, he was yet in the Oxford reckoning a senior; nay, he was, as Newman says. more than once, the foremost man at Oxford, though seldom seen there, when the others took their B.A. degrees. He had taken a double first-class when that distinction had only been achieved by one other man 1—Sir Robert Peel; he had, six years before the movement commenced, begun to create that atmosphere in which the Oxford theology could be heard, by the publication of *The Christian Year*; he had acquired quite unconsciously a well-deserved reputation for sanctity which caused his lightest word to be received almost as a message from a being of another sphere; his very retirement invested him with a sort of halo which belonged to no other man; and besides these adventitious advantages he had the immense benefit of having been brought up from his childhood amid those very surroundings which the Oxford school wished to see everywhere, and his calm, steady conviction was wonderfully impressive. The last words of his Assize Sermon-'he is calmly, soberly, demonstrably sure that, sooner or later, his will be the winning side, and that the victory will be complete, universal, eternal '-give the true key to his character, the true explanation of his strength.

But if it was Keble who first publicly sounded the alarm, it was surely Newman who first gave shape to the design.

¹ Charles Bathurst also took a double first at the same time as Keble.

For the real Oxford Movement began with the first Tract, and for both the conception and the first carrying out of the scheme of the Tracts, Newman, and Newman alone, was responsible. Others were alarmed as soon as he was by the spread of reforming principles; others, like him, feared that the Liberals, who were for improving the Church, would improve it off the face of the earth; others were shocked at the suppression of the Irish sees; and the historical meeting at Hadleigh Rectory was the result. But it was Newman who saw first that the attempt to effect their object by associations and addresses would prove futile; it might be useful as a protest, as a demonstration, as a development of the latent strength of the Church, and so it was. But Newman saw that what was really needed was plain, vigorous, outspoken language, such as could never come from a joint composition, where a word has to be omitted here to suit this one, and a sentiment toned down there to suit that one, where force and effectiveness are generally sacrificed at the altar of caution and judgment. He disliked committees, and so, while others were forming associations and framing addresses, he plunged boldly into the Tracts with the memorable words, 'I am but one of yourselves —a Presbyter.' Nor was it only that Newman was the originator of the idea of Tracts; he was the only one who could write a Tract. Others could give sermons, essays, learned disquisitions; but these are not Tracts. Let anyone compare the earlier Tracts written by Newman with those written by his fellow-labourers, and he will see the difference at once. If the Tracts were the first motive power, if the popular instinct was right, as we believe it was, when it termed the Oxford party 'Tractarians,' then surely Newman must be regarded as the first mover. Moreover, Newman could not only write, he could also preach differently from anyone else. Dean Church is of opinion—and he would be a bold man who would dispute with him on such a point—that the famous four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's were even more effective agents than the Tracts themselves in the early movement. They were listened to eagerly by crowds of undergraduates, and these undergraduates carried the gist of what they heard down with them into every part of the country; and when they became graduates and clergymen themselves they spread them yet more widely and authoritatively, in a more or less diluted form, in town and village pulpits throughout the land. ' Most of my clerical neighbours,' writes Mr. T. Mozley respecting Wiltshire, in 1836, 'warmly sympathize with Newman.'1

act, and scheme onsible. d of reiberals, off the ssion of Rectory that the ldresses st, as a h of the nat was ge, such a word it toned ness are nt. He ng assointo the urselves ne origio could learned compare itten by at once. oular inned the must be ould not one else. nan who famous effective

wement.
aduates,
by heard
ad when
y spread
e or less

the land. respectwman.'

nent, i. 6.

Then the Sermons themselves appeared in print, and were sold so largely and read so eagerly that they put all other sermons out of the market. Once more, Newman exercised a personal influence beyond that of either of his compeers. Keble was regarded as a mysterious being, afar off alike in body and in spirit; Pusey had not yet come to the front; but the striking figure of Newman was known all over Oxford. Those who had not come under the spell nicknamed him 'Noggs' (Nicholas Nickleby had lately come out); but he attracted and fascinated a vast number of the more earnest and thoughtful; they hung upon his words, they imitated his tones and gestures, they were prepared to follow him whithersoever he might lead them; in short, they were bitten by the new mania—to repeat another very obvious witticism—then prevalent.

Yet there was still a place for the third in the great triumvirate—a place which was, in one sense, higher and more important than that of either of the other two. As it was a right instinct which led men to speak of 'Tractarians,' so it was which led them to identify the movement with the name of Pusey. In this way. The movement was a theological movement or it was nothing. Its real strength lay in the fact that it rested upon a broad basis of theology which nothing could shake. The truths inculcated could be traced back from the earliest times in the Christian Church, and in our own Reformed Church from Hooker down to Van Mildert. It was essentially a revival of the old, not an introduction of the new. Now here Dr. Pusey came in as the greatest factor in the movement. Newman welcomed his adherence in 1835 because, as a Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor, he gave a University standing, a dignity-in short, a respectability—to the effort which, as the work of private, obscure men, it did not possess before. But, with all due deference to so high an authority, this seems to us to be a matter of quite minor importance, if of any importance at all. The revival owed nothing to men in high places except what they contributed to it quite unintentionally and unconsciously. In this way, indeed, they rendered it yeoman's service. Bishops. might charge, and professors might lecture, and learned doctors might preach and write against it; but the result of their labours was that they kindly gave it so many gratuitous advertisements. Dr. Pusey's priceless aid was, in our opinion, quite apart from his University position. It was the aid of a deeply read theologian, who saw at once that the work required to be tried by a higher, a more theological, standard, and was quite sure that it would abide the test. The adherence of the new ally was marked at once by a striking change in the character of the Tracts. The light but effective sharp-shooting of the earlier members was exchanged for a powerful battery of heavy artillery which was brought to bear upon the enemy with deadly force. It seems a strange misnomer to call ponderous treatises of a hundred pages and more 'Tracts'; but, call them what you will, they answered their purpose. Men might abuse the movement more furiously than ever, but they could no longer affect to despise it. attempt of a handful of men, mostly young, to revolutionize the Church might be compared to the pretensions of the three tailors of Tooley Street to govern Great Britain; but the comparison would lose its force if these same young men could be proved to be fighting under the banners of the greatest names in English theology. Hence those long Catenæ Patrum, which form the matter of several of the Tracts, though they may be a weariness to the flesh to read, were yet of immense value: for they proved to demonstration that the Tract-writers, who were accused of being Papists in disguise for teaching such doctrines as Baptismal Regeneration, the Apostolical Succession, and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, had the great luminaries of Anglicanism on their side. It was Dr. Pusey who placed the movement on a theological basis: a learned man himself, he developed the learned side in others. It was he who started the 'Library of the Fathers,' and encouraged at Oxford in all sorts of ways the study of theologythe surest witness to the soundness of the new school. And not only was he the best acquainted with the early Fathers and the great Anglican divines, but he also possessed what was very rare in those days, a thorough knowledge of the theological speculations of Germany. 'What a difference it would have made,' once exclaimed Dean Stanley, 'if Newman had known German!' The answer, not to the remark, but to what the remark implied, is, 'But Dr. Pusey did know German.'

It should be added that the influence of the three leaders—and, indeed, of all the leading men, as a rule, in the early Oxford Movement—was greatly increased by the respect which their personal characters inspired. They were high-minded, honourable Christian gentlemen, who were obviously sacrificing their worldly prospects in the interest of what they regarded as the truth. They were men who were highly distinguished at the University, in days when University distinction was a far surer passport to advancement in the Church than it is now. Dean Church hints, with great delicacy but quite unmistakably, the superiority of them to their opponents; and those whose Ox-

327

1891

he three he comcould be st names m, which may be se value; c-writers, teaching jostolical crist, had

It was al basis; nothers, and encology—bl. And Fathers sed what the theoit would man had

it would nan had to but to German.' eaders—y Oxford ich their

, honouring their ed as the ed at the far surer

w. Dean ably, the hose Oxford memories carry them back so far know how painfully true this is. Generous and intelligent young men would be keen to mark this, and it is no wonder that they were attracted to the banners of leaders who were as saintly as they were cultured; and all the more so when they saw the bitterness and unfairness of the opposition they met with from those who ought at least to have given them a fair hearing, if not to have actually supported them. A strong expression of this feeling, written in 1845, is quoted by Dean Church (p. 332). The Dean himself is severe, but surely not too severe, upon the conduct of the University authorities. They, at any rate, ought to have known that these 'novelties' were really no novelties which were calling forth such a torrent of abuse and such a violence of opposition as transgressed all the bounds of Christian courtesy. Looking back from the vantage-ground of fifty years, it seems incredible that men like Pusey, Keble, Newman, Williams, Copeland, Moberly, the Wilberforces, and the Mozleys could be suspected of intentionally conspiring against the Church which by their ordination vows they were bound to defend. But students of Church history have learned, to their sorrow, that they must be surprised at nothing when the cry of 'No Popery' is in the air; they know that history was but repeating itself in those times of excitement; it was only the case of the Gordon riots in another form; fairness, justice, self-control, ay, and the very evidence of the senses, were all thrown to the winds in both cases alike.

Oddly enough, the storm nearly reached its climax in connection with the writings of two of the gentlest, most reasonable, most inoffensive, and most loyal of all who took part in the Oxford Movement-Isaac Williams and John Keble. It was in 1837 that Isaac Williams contributed the famous No. 80, 'On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge,' to the Tracts for the Times. The gist of it was that all through the Bible, and especially in the Gospels, we find traces of divine truth being concealed from those who are unworthy to receive it; and he sums up in one practical conclusion 'which is full of awe, indeed, but also full of consolation, as tending to keep the mind quiet in times of universal movement and excitement.' The conclusion is 'that Jesus Christ is now, and has been at all times, hiding Himself from us, but at the same time exceedingly desirous to communicate Himself, and that exactly in proportion as we show ourselves worthy He will disclose Himself to us.'1 proofs which the writer adduces are so obvious that it is

¹ Tract 80, p. 81.

strange they should have escaped the notice of any Bible reader. The Tract is simply the protest of a delicate, sensitive, and deeply religious mind against the Bavavola (to borrow a word from the writer's favourite heathen author) of popular religionists who vulgarized the most sacred truths. The storm of indignation which the Tract produced caused Mr. Williams to write three years later (1840) another (No. 87), in which he enters at still greater length upon the same subject, not abandoning one of his former positions. followed No. 89, 'On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church.' It is one of the most thoughtful and lucid accounts in the English language of an aspect of religion which no one who has the slightest acquaintance with theology can fail to have observed. By 'mysticism' Keble meant simply the working out of the idea suggested by St. Paul in the text, 'The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.' The Tract is an amplification in prose of the theory which he had broached in verse in his well-known hymn-

There is a Book, who runs may read-

which had given no offence when it had been published thirteen years before. Keble writes very much on the lines of William Law's later works, only without his Behmenism. One can quite understand that both Williams and Keble would be quite out of harmony with the popular religion of the day; and if their lucubrations had been published separately by men on whose names no stigma had been cast, they would in all probability have been simply neglected as 'caviare to the general,' just as Law's own later works were. But when they appeared among the obnoxious Tracts for the Times they provoked not neglect, but wrath. The two dreadful words 'reserve' and 'mysticism' alarmed men. Here was a confirmation of their worst forebodings! They had long suspected it, but now the Tract-writers, by their own confession, were not open and above board. There was something kept back, a dark mystery, a disciplina arcani, a secret meaningin short, everything which plain straightforward Englishmen most abhorred. It must be tolerated no longer! The very idea of representing the two gentle, guileless poets, who had no other aim but to do all the good they could without injuring any living creature, as a couple of clerical Guy Fauxes who were bent upon blowing up, not the Houses of Parliament, but the Church of God, was too ludicrous! Then No. 89 was

tl

b

h

ir

re

W

y

A

th

fa

be

ha

ny Bible te, sensivola (to uthor) of d truths. d caused ther (No. the same Then he Early htful and f religion theology le meant . Paul in

eation of

ne things

ose of the

ll-known

published the lines hmenism. nd Keble eligion of eparately ney would caviare to But when he Times dreadful ere was a long susonfession, hing kept neaningnglishmen The very , who had rithout inuy Fauxes

arliament,

No. 89 was

followed by No. 90 in the early part of 1841, and the full explosion came. To tamper with the Articles was to touch the Palladium, and the temple must fall.

> Fatale aggressi sacrato avellere templo Palladium.

It was in vain urged that the interpretation of the Articles suggested by No. 90 was practically and almost necessarily adopted in some point or other by all parties alike in the Church. No! the man who wrote that Tract was paltering with his most solemn engagements; he was not only in grievous error, he was immoral and dishonest-a man with

whom it would not be safe to trust one's purse.1

But while we admit that the course taken was clumsy and extravagant, we are bound to add that No. 90 appears to us to stand on a very different footing from that of Nos. 80, 87. and 89. Perhaps we are tempted to read between the lines. because we know from his own repeated avowal that the writer's mind was wavering in its attachment to the English Church when he wrote it. 'Things after No. 90,' writes Dean Church (p. 255), 'were never the same as before.' Unquestionably they were not; but was not the beginning of the change in Newman's own mind before he published that famous Tract? The Four Tutors and the Board of Heads of Houses did but force his hand.

The condemnation of No. 90 was the first public act of the Oxford authorities against the party; and it was so clumsily managed that it elicited sympathy with the condemned among some who had held aloof from them before. We are quite sure that Newman was perfectly honest in his belief that the Tract was really intended to defend, not to undermine, the Anglican Church; but we are also sure that his own mind was already on the sliding scale which led him inevitably to Rome. How can we help being so, when we remember that No. 90 was published in 1841, and that the writer speaks (1864) of a famous article he had written two years before (1839), as 'the last words he ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans'? We quite agree with Dean Church that this was an exaggerated statement, and that much which Newman wrote afterwards was written by him in perfect good faith as an Anglican clergyman. But surely the beginning of the end had already come. The fatal discovery of the bearing of the Monophysite and of the Donatist controversies had already been made: the 'securus judicat orbis terrarum'

¹ This was actually said by a leading Evangelical.

had already rung as a death-knell in his ears; the note of antiquity which kept him to Anglicanism was sounding fainter and fainter; and the note of Catholicity which lured him to Rome was sounding louder and louder. Like other great leaders, he was deeply influenced by many who were called his followers; and there is no question that some of them were already embarked in a course which could have but one ending. By these he was urged ever onward, onward; and the 'atrocious scheme,' as he calls it, of the Jerusalem Bishopric snapped one of the last cords which prevented him from drifting away from his old moorings. His letters from 1841 to 1845 plainly show that it was only a question of time. Deathbed scenes are generally painful; and the scene of Newman's death to Anglicanism, protracted through four long years, is no exception to the rule.1 There is a melancholy interest in the correspondence between Newman and his sister during this period; it is full of heart on both sides. Nothing can exceed the thoughtfulness and good sense of the sister's letters and the affectionate consideration on the part of Newman; but they are very sad, and there is a real sense of relief when the end comes.

The interest in the great leader is so overpowering that we are almost tempted to put too much in the background the parallel cases of others; but we must not forget that he was preceded to Rome, not followed, by some of the most eminent of those who claimed to be his followers. The case of Mr. Ward is too well known to be dwelt upon at length; we need only remark that he pushed on Newman, instead of being pushed on by him, and that, like Newman, he had not had the benefit of an early Church training. The fatuity of the Oxford Heads came to a climax in this case. Mr. Ward's book, The Ideal of a Christian Church, laid itself only too open to their censures; 2 but when they might have been in the right, they perversely and deliberately put themselves in the wrong. Not content with condemning the book, which, as it seems to us, it was their duty to do, they proceeded to degrade the writer by depriving him of all his University degrees, 'thus reducing him to an undergraduate in statu pupillari and a commoner's short gown' (Church, p. 327), the full absurdity of which proceeding can only be appreciated

th

W

ye ha

¹ Newman himself says, 'From the end of 1841 I was on my deathbed as regards my membership with the Anglican Church, though at the time I became aware of it only by degrees.'

And even *The Ideal* is not so anti-Anglican as some of Mr. Ward's

articles in The British Critic.

33I

e note of ng fainter d him to ner great re called of them e but one ard; and Bishopric him from rom 1841 of time. scene of four long elancholy d his sister

Nothing the sister's rt of Newse of relief

ering that ackground get that he f the most The case at length; instead of

instead of the had not a fatuity of Mr. Ward's lf only too we been in emselves in coock, which, roceeded to a University ate in statu p. 327), the appreciated

n my deathbed ugh at the time

of Mr. Ward's

by those who remember Mr. Ward's peculiar figure. Nor was this all. They also proposed to institute proprio motu what was virtually a new test; but this measure was a little too strong even for excited partizans; an outcry was raised, and the proposal was abandoned. But the climax was not yet reached. Flying at higher game than Mr. Ward, they disinterred the buried Tract 90, and proposed to condemn the great 'fons et origo mali' by an utterly unjustifiable retrospective act. But they were happily stopped at the outset by the interposition of the proctorial veto, Dean Church himself being the junior, but, if report be true, the really influential proctor, though with excellent taste he entirely ignores his own part in the affair in his book. Then followed the secession of Mr. Ward, Mr. Oakley, Mr. Capes, Mr. Dalgairns, Mr. Faber, and several others who preceded the greatest of all to Rome.

It was fondly hoped that these secessions, and especially Newman's, would put a final stop to the whole movement: but never was an expectation more utterly falsified by the event. There was scarcely even a temporary turn of the tide. If it ceased to be 'the Oxford Movement,' as Dean Church rightly points out, it was only because it extended its area. Newman was a great and trusted leader, perhaps the greatest and most trusted of any in this century; he was in one sense, though by no means, as we have seen, in all senses, the central figure in the group of the Tractarians; but the vital energy of the principles they advocated did not depend upon any one man, however great. Some just preceded, some followed him to Rome; some underwent a violent reaction and became ultra-Liberals; but the vast majority remained firm to the Church of their baptism, and wrought a work in her which had hardly been commenced when Newman deserted her. Comparisons are odious; but it may be safely asserted that the names of those who remained will suffer nothing by being compared with the names of those who left. A party which still retained such men as E. B. Pusey,1 John Keble, Thomas Keble, Isaac Williams, W. J. Copeland, Charles Marriott,

¹ Newman himself has rendered noble testimony in the Apologia to the consistency of Pusey as an Anglican from first to last. And yet Pusey had received at least as great provocation as either Newman or Ward. His suspension from preaching in the University pulpit for two years was nothing less than an insult. Keble, too, who was equally firm, had been sorely provoked. What can be said of the persistent refusal to confer priest's orders on his most estimable curate, Mr. Peter Young, simply because he held views on the Eucharist which, to say the least, are perfectly consistent with the soundest English Churchmanship?

J. B. Mozley, G. Moberly, H. A. Woodgate, W. Palmer, W. F. Hook, Sir G. Prevost, R. W. Church, and numberless minor lights, had no reason to despair. Those who think the secessions put a stop to the course of the stone which had been set a-rolling must indeed have closed their eyes, not only to the plain facts of history, but to what is actually going on all around them.

There are three points in connexion with these early

Tractarians which deserve special notice:-

I. They were men of deep piety themselves, and men who deeply valued piety in others. Canon Carter, who knew him well, tells us of Dr. Pusey that 'he was drawn to the devout side of the Evangelicals, their reverence of the Holy Scriptures, their love of Christ'; and that 'he recognized in personal intercourse what was true in the piety and devotion of the more orthodox among Protestant Dissenters,' Only those who can remember the horror with which the Evangelicals and Protestant Dissenters of the day regarded the very name of Pusey, and the bitter things they said of him, can appreciate the significance of this, or realize how entirely all personal feelings must have been stifled by the sight of piety in any form. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon the instinct of piety in Mr. Keble, for it was really and obviously the most distinctive trait in his character. Nor was it less marked in Mr. Marriott, Mr. Williams, and others of that generation. This, indeed, so far as our recollection serves, was generally recognized by the Evangelicals themselves, even when they were most bitter against the whole system of Tractarianism. The very fact that the men who were, as they deemed, in such grievous error were 'good men' only embittered them all the more against the principles which led these good men astray and prevented them from embracing 'the truth.'

2. They were essentially men of learning and culture. There is a calm, quiet strength in their writings which makes them more impressive on the second and third reading than on the first. They grow upon you, and you begin to see that there is more in them than you at first supposed. There is no parade of learning, no brilliancy of ornament, no aim at effect; they said what they had to say in the most severely simple style; but it was well worth saying, and the style was generally as pure and refined as it was plain. The essays of Mr. J. B. Mozley, the Plain Sermons by the Authors of the Tracts for the Times, the essays, pamphlets, and sermons generally of Mr. Keble, and last, but not least, all the writings

1891

er, W. F. is minor ne secesad been only to ng on all

se early

ind men ter, who drawn to e of the e recogpiety and ssenters.' hich the regarded v said of lize how d by the to dwell eally and ter. Nor nd others collection als themhe whole men who ood men' principles nem from

I culture, ich makes ding than o see that There is no aim at t severely style was e essays of the is sermons e writings

of Dean Church himself, are good instances of what we mean. There is a reserve of force about them all which makes one not at all surprised that some of them, which fell flat at first, became better appreciated when they became better known. This was notably the case with regard to Mr. J. B. Mozley's essays, which were never appreciated at their proper value until the writer had made a deep impression by his Bampton Lectures, which drew attention to his earlier and hitherto neglected works.

3. They were men who made much of honest parish work, such as personal teaching in week-day and Sunday schools, systematic house-to-house visiting, the taking an interest in the moral welfare of each individual in their flock. Mr. Peter Young's account of Keble's pastoral work at Hensley in Coleridge's Life, the well-known work of Dr. Hook at Coventry and at Leeds, of Mr. Butler at Wantage, of Mr. Gregory at Lambeth, of Dr. Wordsworth at Stanford-in-the-Vale, of Mr. C. P. Eden at Aberford, are good illustrations; and there were hundreds of good parish priests of the same type who now 'rest from their labours,' but 'whose works'works of plain, practical usefulness-' do follow them.' Looking back fifty years, one who was the intimate friend of some of the leaders of the Oxford Movement writes of it: 'Begun with lofty aims, disinterested motives, genius, learning, singular gifts of personal character, and an undoubted cause, it deeply affected those who could sympathize with the prime movers and understand the appeal.'2

Now, it is no use disguising the fact that there are complaints abroad that the successors of these old High Churchmen are not—exceptis excipiendis—the equals of their predecessors. Allowance must of course be made for the laudator temporis acti tendency of old age. From Nestor downwards the old have always been apt to depreciate the existing generation in comparison with that of their prime. Still the question should be fairly faced: 'Is it, or is it not, true that there is a section of the Church party—we utterly scout the notion that it is more than a section—in which personal piety holds a second place to ritual correctness, real theological learning to the merest ephemeral religious literature, showy outside work to the old-fashioned plan of house-to-

¹ See Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (1st ed.): 'The Earnest Parish Priest;' especially the letter of the Rev. W. Inge, Curate of Aberford.

² Introduction to Letters from Rome on the Occasion of the Ecumenical Council, 1869-1870, p. 5. The Introduction was written in 1890.

house visitation, and real teaching in school?' If it be so, we make bold to say that no frequency of church services, no elaborateness of ritual, not even 'the six points,' can make up for these deficiencies. It was not in this way that the Trac-'The Movement,' writes Dean tarians made their mark. Church, 'had its spring in the consciences and characters of its leaders. To these men religion really meant the most awful and most seriously personal thing on earth.' If there are those to whom it means anything less than this, these men will certainly fail, and deserve to fail. We shall hardly be suspected of thinking lightly of a seemly and Catholic ritual, but it should be the outcome, not the be-all and endall, of religion. The danger, if danger there be, seems to us to be very much owing to the mischievous activity of opponents, who, by their opposition to practices which are plainly primitive and Catholic, and to symbolism which is to many minds essential to worship, force so-called ritualists to dwell so much upon the external, and to do so in a combative instead of a quiet Christian spirit. When a fortress is assailed, the defenders must concentrate their chief attention upon the chief points of assault. It is thus that the attention of some Churchmen of the present day is diverted from the three points we have noticed. The anti-ritualists also do harm by trailing a red-herring across the scent, misleading men from the track in which the real peril lies by raising the cuckoocry of 'Rome.' We believe it is the merest fallacy to suppose there is a fear of any serious defalcation to Rome; but there is a fear of men, who are almost compelled by their position and principles to devote much time and trouble to externals, losing their spirituality, their taste for real theological study, and their sense of the value of homely parish work. The heroes of the past with whom we have been dealing fell into no such snares as these; those who do will assuredly cripple their energies, and their fighting will be but a beating of the air.

July

be so, we vices, no

make up ne Trac-

es Dean

acters of

the most If there his, these

ll hardly

Catholic

and end-

ms to us

of oppoe plainly

to many

dwell so

e instead

ailed, the

upon the

of some

the three

harm by

men from

e cuckoo-

y to sup-

ome; but

by their

trouble to

eal theo-

ely parish

een deal-

o do will vill be but

ART. III.—ROYAL EDINBURGH.

Royal Edinburgh: her Saints, Kings, Prophets, and Poets. By Mrs. OLIPHANT, Author of Makers of Florence, Makers of Venice, &c. With Illustrations by George Reid, R.S.A. (London and New York, 1890.)

EDINBURGH is one of those cities which have a rare attraction alike for the poet and the prose writer. The grey metropolis of the north shares this distinction with a few even more famous and beautiful towns-with the City of the Seven Hills and the City of the Violet Crown, with Rome and Athens, with Venice and Florence. This is partly owing, no doubt, to the natural beauty of her situation, partly to the romance which belongs to her history, but even more to the enthusiastic devotion of her sons. In all ages this strong and deeplyrooted attachment to the 'auld countree' has been a marked feature of the Scottish character, and is the more noteworthy from the spirit of adventure and enterprise and the commercial shrewdness with which it is combined. There is not a Scottish traveller in the far North-West, not a colonist in New Zealand or South Africa, who is not justly proud of the old capital, who does not in his heart of hearts think no other city in the world can compare with her, just as to him the national songs and strathspeys of Scotland are sweeter than any other music that has ever sounded in his ears. Through all his wanderings in primæval forests and on foreign shores, in all his toil and money-getting, his heart still turns to the old town on the windy heights with a love which time and distance can never alter-

'True to the kindred points of heaven and home.'

'There is no Edinburgh emigrant far or near, from China to Peru,' writes one of the most eloquent of living Scotchmen,' but he or she carries some lively pictures of the mind—some sunset behind the Castle cliffs, some snow scene, some maze of city lamps—indelible in the memory and delightful to study in the intervals of toil.'

Certainly no city has been more often described in prose and verse. The charms of her high seat and the great memories which have made her even more interesting than beautiful have been celebrated by the foremost of dead and

¹ Mr. R. L. Stevenson.

living writers. The famous passage in Marmion where Scott paints the Empress of the North seated on her hilly throne—

'Her palaces, imperial bowers; Her castle, proof to hostile powers; Her stately halls and holy towers'—

rises at once to our minds, together with those still more graceful prose pictures scattered up and down the novels in which he describes the grandeur and gloom of the Castle, wrapt in wreaths of smoke, or the glimmering of the lights in the irregular lines of tall houses, rising ever higher and higher till they seem to twinkle in the middle sky. Burns has invoked the city which received him so hospitably in his well-known ode to

'Edina! Scotia's darling seat!'

Aytoun has written his stirring lays of high Dunedin Mr. Ruskin has by turns in her maiden strength. expatiated on the beauties of the old and denounced the ugliness of the new town with the same fervour. Ten or twelve years ago Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson gave us a volume of picturesque notes on Edinburgh, slight indeed, but admirably vivid and forcible; and now Mrs. Oliphant, the veteran novelist, after telling us her tale of the makers of Florence and the wonders of Venice, devotes her pen to the same theme and records the glorious past of her 'own romantic town.' It would be hard to find a writer better qualified for the task. Mrs. Oliphant possesses in an exceptional manner the very qualities which are the most needed for the historian of Edinburgh. In the first place she is Scotch herself, bred and born on Scottish soil; and the lights and shadows of Scottish life, the interiors of old Scottish families, are, as she has shown us in one of her latest novels, more familiar to her than to any other living writer. And then too she combines in a rare degree the painstaking industry, the accuracy and impartiality which are necessary for the historian with the practised novelist's keen appreciation of the pathetic element, a quality which enables her to render full justice to the romance which is so remarkable a feature in the ancient history of Scotland. The most thrilling scenes of Scottish story, the glory and the tragedy which meet us by turns in the lives of the Stuart kings, have never been more vividly set forth than in these pages.

Mrs. Oliphant has been fortunate in obtaining the help of so good and so essentially a Scottish artist as Mr. George

h

ere Scott throne—

July

rill more novels in e Castle, lights in nd higher s has inhis well-

Dunedin y turns enounced fervour. tevenson dinburgh, and now her tale e, devotes is past of d a writer sses in an the most place she and the d Scottish vels, more And then industry, y for the ion of the ender full ure in the scenes of eet us by

he help of r. George

been more

Reid. His illustrations include not only the chief points o note in Edinburgh itself—the Castle under its different aspects, the streets and monuments, the old houses, churches, and gateways in both quarters of the town—but many places, both in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital and in other parts of Scotland, which have been at one time or another connected with the history of her kings. Thus Mr. Reid gives us striking views of the ancient Abbey of Dunfermline, of Stirling Castle and Linlithgow Palace, of Holyrood and the ruins of St. Andrews. All of them are faithful representations, and several are remarkably picturesque in effect, such, for instance, as the view of Edinburgh at night from the Castle rock, with the lights twinkling in the windows of the lofty houses and the crescent moon hanging over the distant spires of the Calton Hill. But it is to be regretted that the artist has made a rule of executing his work under such gloomy conditions. The constant presence of snow and rain in his pictures is, to say the least, depressing, and seems to bear out the traditional reply of the Scotsman who, when asked by an anxious enquirer whether it always rained north of the Tweed, replied, 'Na; sometimes it snaws.' That the climate of Edinburgh leaves much to be desired we are quite prepared to admit, but even Mr. Stevenson, who calls it one of the vilest upon earth, owns that there are bright and temperate days, when the sun does shine and the soft airs blow pleasantly from the hills. Either these days have not smiled on Mr. Reid or else he has a natural preference for dark skies and stormy evenings. There is a certain fitness in seeing the Bass Rock set in the midst of the raging elements, and the towers of Holyrood, we confess, look picturesque when they are capped with snow; but are George Street and Princes Street, we are inclined to ask, invariably a sea of mud, and do St. Giles's crown and St. Mary's Bath always rise out of flooded streets, where luckless foot passengers pick their way in fear and trembling, or battle with umbrellas against the wind? It may be necessary to supply the monuments on the Calton Hill with an effective background of storm and cloud, but Stirling Castle does not need a sky of inky blackness or torrents of falling rain to set off its grandeur, and St. Margaret's Loch has been sometimes seen in happier circumstances than a blinding snowstorm. Even Linlithgow, the joyous home of dance and song, is seen at the dusky close of a stormy day, and hardly bears out the idea Sir Walter Scott has given us of the fair palace where the merry linnet sings in June and all is 'so blythe and glad'—

'The saddest heart might pleasure take To see all nature gay.

Royal Edinburgh, as the title implies, deals in a record of the royal personages whose names have been connected with the city from the earliest ages. And first of all we have the story of good Queen Margaret, whose name figures among the oldest saints of Scotland, and whose gentle presence and beneficent rule did more, perhaps, to soften the rude manners of the King and Court, and to civilize the realm, than any other influence. Mrs. Oliphant's assertion that before Margaret's time the history of Scotland was 'little but fable' may strike us as not strictly accurate, when we call to mind the researches made in recent times by certain eminent antiquaries; but setting this aside, her picture of the fair Saxon queen, whose memory lived so fondly in the hearts of her subjects, is one of the most charming chapters in the book. No prettier legend was ever chronicled than that of the

coming of Margaret to the Scottish shores.

The daughter of Edward the Outlaw and sister of Edgar Atheling, the rightful heir to the crown of England, Margaret had been brought up with the rest of her family at the Court of her maternal grandfather, the King of Hungary, one of the richest and most splendid princes in Christendom. Seeing the Norman Conqueror firmly seated on the throne of England, Edgar had given up all hope of asserting his claims, and had embarked with his mother and sisters and a few noble Saxons to return to Hungary; but the ship in which the royal family sailed was driven by wind and storm to take shelter in the Firth of Forth, under a headland known as St. Margaret's Hope. Here the natives crowded to look on the distinguished strangers who were so unlike themselves, and who bore with them such rich stores of gold, and jewels, and rare and precious things. Among them came the King of Scotland himself, Malcolm Canmore, the son of the murdered Duncan, whose own youth had been spent in Siward's house in Northumberland, and who having learnt the Latin and English tongues there, although we are told he could not read, could at least hold converse with the foreign princes. The old chronicler goes on to tell how the beauty of the English princess, and the 'pleasantness of her jocund speech,' won the rude king's heart, and how in the same year, 1070, Margaret was brought with great rejoicing to the royal palace of Dunfermline, in the heart of the forests of Fife, and there wedded to King Malcolm. The transformation which the young Queen effected in the primitive Court and people

W

1891

record of cted with have the samong sence and manners than any at before but fable' 1 to mind nent antinent antiner taken of her the book.

of Edgar Margaret the Court one of the . Seeing f England, s, and had ole Saxons the royal shelter in Margaret's he distin-, and who s, and rare of Scotland d Duncan, house in Latin and ld not read, nces. The he English eech,' won rear, 1070, the royal of Fife, and tion which

and people

among whom her lot was cast during the twenty-three years of her married life has been described by Theodoric, the monk of Durham, who was himself for a considerable period her confessor and spiritual adviser. Under her influence the great cathedral arose close by the royal palace, and while the builders were at work on those glorious arches which still stand, worn and battered by age, in the nave of Dunfermline Abbey, Margaret was devising golden ornaments for the altars of the new church, and the Court ladies sat at work in her rooms, embroidering tapestries and costly hangings under her direction. The artistic tastes and love of splendour which the stranger queen had brought with her were as beneficial to her lord's rude subjects as her goodness. She adorned the palace with the beautiful things she had brought with her, provided fine clothes for her retainers and dishes of gold and silver for the royal table, and used all her influence to induce her husband to give up his barbarous manners and 'live honestly and civilly.' Theodoric draws a touching picture of the rude middle-aged warrior gazing with adoring wonder at the fair young Queen as she knelt in prayer at the altar or bent over the pages of the sacred book which he could not read himself, but which he liked to hold in his hands and kiss for her sake. On one occasion, it is said, he sent for a goldsmith and had the manuscript which Margaret had been reading encased in gold and ornamented with jewels,

The good Queen's charities were boundless, and the monkish chronicler remarks naïvely that the poor followed her about in crowds wherever she went, and the weak and The English suffering looked upon her as their mother. captives whom the King brought back from the raids which he made over the Border, and who led miserable lives as the bondmen of their conquerors, were the especial objects of Margaret's solicitude. She sent her servants to visit them from house to house, and alleviate as far as possible the horrors of their condition. The pilgrims who came from all parts of the kingdom to the great religious centre at St. Andrews also excited her interest, and at her bidding houses of shelter were built along the stormy waters of the Firth, on the very shores where she had first landed, and boats were supplied for the passage across the sea. With Edinburgh itself Margaret is especially connected. There it was, within the precincts of the rude fortress which already crowned the top of the impregnable rock, that she raised the little Norman chapel which still bears her name. Nothing in Edinburgh is so deeply interesting as that little chapel,

189

alr

wh

rer

hig

bo

Tr

pa

Ki

wa

Ph

Th

the

pla

pre

un

ha

the

be

M

an

br

mo

he

me

ac

H

fir

E

be

the

ca

bu

an

E

to

cit pe

th

res

se

for

en

W

with its narrow windows and low doorways enriched with Norman mouldings, on the black mound of basalt which marks the summit of the Castle crag. If those walls do not actually belong to the oratory which Margaret raised, they stand on the spot where she knelt, and the ground is sacred for her sake. Here she came in her failing health when King Malcolm had parted from her to go forth with his sons on his last Border war and carry fire and sword into Northumberland. Here she prayed and watched day by day, hour by hour, for the news of husband's and sons' return. Then at length the fatal tidings came, and she heard that the King had fallen in the fight at Alnwick.

'It was November, dark and cheerless both within and without, and the Queen would seem to have been prostrated for a day or two by the sad news; but on the fourth day she rose from her bed and tottered to the little chapel on the rock to hear Mass for the last time, and receive the Holy Sacrament in preparation for death. She then returned to her rooms with the pallor of death already on her face, and bidding all around—"me," says the priest, "and the others who stood by," to recommend her to Christ, asked that the black rood should be brought to her. This was the most holy of all the relics which she had brought with her to Scotland. It was a case of pure gold in the form of a cross, ornamented with marvellous work, bearing the image of the Saviour curiously carved in ivory, and enclosing a portion of the true Cross, proved to be so by many miracles. The Queen took it in her hands, pressed it to her dying breast, and touched with it her eyes and face. While thus devoutly employed, with her thoughts diverted from all earthly things, Margaret was brought back to her sorrow by the sudden entrance of her son Ethelred, who had returned from the defeated army to carry to his mother the dreadful news of the death not only of his father but of his elder brother. The sight of his mother in extremity, almost gone, no doubt confused the poor boy, still little more than a stripling and with that weight of disaster on his head, and he answered to her faltering enquiry at first that all was well. Margaret adjured him by the holy cross in her arms to tell her the truth; then, when she heard of the double blow, burst out into an impassioned cry. "I thank Thee, Lord," she said, "that givest me this agony to bear in my death hour." Her life had been much blessed; she had known few sorrows. It was as a crown to that pure and love-lit existence that she had this moment of bitterest anguish before God gave to His beloved sleep '(p. 26).

A halo of legend soon gathered round the memory of the good Queen. Her children and servants saw the hand of God in the white mists which rose from the sea to hide the funeral train as they secretly bore her remains down the Castle Rock to escape from the turbulent chiefs who were

XUM

which which do not d, they cred for King s on his perland. our, for gth the allen in

July

without, day or bed and ast time, She then her face, ers who ck rood f all the a case of us work, ory, and y many er dying devoutly gs, Marrance of army to ly of his other in till little is head. as well. her the into an vest me n much n to that

y of the nand of ide the own the

bitterest

already rising in arms. And the same chronicler tells how, when, a hundred years later, the sainted Queen's bones were removed from their first tomb to a holier spot before the high altar in Dunfermline Abbey, the coffin could not be borne past the spot where King Malcolm's bones were laid. True to her lord even in death, the loyal wife would not be parted from him, and it was found necessary to remove the King's remains to the same burial-place. Long ages afterwards the bones of the royal pair were carried off by Philip II. of Spain to enrich his store of relics at the Escurial. They were frequently exposed on solemn occasions to receive the worship of the faithful, and were so often taken from one place to another that in the end they disappeared, and the present resting-place of the best of the Scottish queens is unknown.

A period of trouble and anarchy followed on the happy days of Malcolm and Margaret's reign, but in the end their sons regained the throne, and their daughter Maud became the wife of Henry I. of England. The youngest of Margaret's sons, David, inherited his mother's pious tastes, and when he became king, after the death of his childless brothers, he covered Scotland 'with kirkis and abbavis.' His most famous ecclesiastical foundation was the abbey which he built in the valley at the foot of the castle where his mother died, to receive the relic of the black rood, which had acquired a still higher sanctity from her memory. Holyrood House, as King David's new monastery was called, from the first was endowed with part of the dues and taxes of Edinburgh, and one half of the tallow, lard, and hides of the beasts slain in the town. It is evident from this charter that the borough was already a place of some importance. The canons of Holyrood also obtained the royal permission to build on the ground which lay between them and the Castle; and houses sprung up on the country road leading towards Edinburgh, and the new town at the foot of the Castle Rock took the name of the Canongate. But the growth of the city was interrupted by the fierce strife of the wars of independence, and it was not until the accession of a new race that Edinburgh became the centre of government and the fixed residence of the kings of Scotland. Again and again the Castle was destroyed and rebuilt, now by the Scots themselves, now by the English invaders, and Edward III., the founder of Windsor Castle, was the first to extend the area encircled by the walls, and thus allow of room for a palace as well as a fortress. The Stuart kings, indeed, preferred the

ro

de

e

aı

m

de

ti

m

hi

ch

fe

w

ac

R

fe

cr

0

di

ce

le

he

se

abbey in the valley to the grim eyrie on the top of the lonely rocks; but it was in the Castle that the Parliament met, in the noble hall built by James I. early in the fifteenth century, and lately restored on so splendid a scale by a private citizen of Edinburgh. Some years before this a charter was granted by Robert III., the second of the Stuart line, by which Edinburgh burghers were allowed the privilege of building houses within the Castle walls. Then they reared the tall straight houses, with steep roofs tiled with stone slabs, which took the place of the low huts of earlier days along the slope of the long ridge, and the old town of Edinburgh gradually rose into being.

The second and longest part of Mrs. Oliphant's book has for its title 'The Stewards of Scotland,' and is devoted to the history of the Stuart kings. The origin of this illustrious race has been traced by old writers through the Banquo of Shakespeare's Macbeth back to the mythical heroes of Celtic lore and the kings who reigned over Munster in the first centuries of the Christian era. Modern historians are content with a more modest record. They bring forward trustworthy evidence to show that the Stuarts were originally a Norman family, one of whom, Walter Fitzalan, was appointed by King David I. to the hereditary dignity of Grand Steward or Seneschal of Scotland. His descendants took their name from this so-called office, which they held for nearly two centuries, and rose into high favour during the wars of independence. One of them, another Walter, was knighted by Robert Bruce for his valour on the field of Bannockburn, and married the King's daughter Marjory. So the crown of Scotland came 'with a lass' into the Stuart family, and the son of Marjory and grandson of Robert Bruce was the first monarch of a race which reigned for more than three hundred years over the northern kingdom.

In all history there is no more fascinating theme than the fortunes of this brilliant, romantic, and hapless house. For centuries the Stuart kings and queens have divided the world into bitter partizans, and at the present day men are ready to contend as fiercely with their pens in the cause of Mary, Queen of Scots, or Charles I. as they were of old with their swords. That personal charm with which each member of the race was endowed for good or for evil, that irresistible attraction which drew men of all ranks to their side during their lifetime, still throws its glamour over posterity, and the writers of a colder and more critical age still grow warm as they tell the tale of the glories and the luckless fate of this

e lonely t, in the century, citizen granted h Edinhouses straight ook the of the

July

ook has to the ustrious iquo of f Celtic he first re cond trustnally a vas ap-Grand ts took neld for ing the er, was field of Iarjory. Stuart Robert or more

han the e. For e world f Mary, th their nber of esistible during and the rarm as of this royal line. And, whatever their faults and follies, the Stuarts were, it must be owned, a richly gifted race. All of them alike, whether English or Scottish kings, were men of undoubted courage and capacity, gallant soldiers and administrators of no mean order. All of them too, without exception, were men of fine taste, generous patrons of art and letters, and often themselves distinguished poets and scholars; and although their high spirits and love of mirth made them embrace every opportunity of escaping from the bondage of courtly etiquette, to mix freely among their subjects, they maintained even at these times a degree of decorum and dignity seldom seen in that ruder age. On the whole there is much to be said for the view of the old Scottish antiquary David Symson, who, writing in the beginning of the last century, not very long after the flight of James II., boldly gave it as his opinion 'that the Stuarts were a race of as mercifull, just, and heroick Princes as any nation was ever blessed with.

The qualities and the faults, the charm and the cruel misfortunes, which pursued every member of the Stuart house are all conspicuous in the five kings of Scotland whose history Mrs. Oliphant tells in her vivid and glowing narrative. All five came to the throne while they were yet children; all five came to an untimely end in the flower of their manhood. James I. spent eighteen years in captivity, and fell a victim to a traitor's plot. James II. was six years of age when he ascended the throne, and after a troubled reign was accidentally killed by the explosion of a gun at the siege of Roxburgh when he was only twenty-nine. James III.'s fate was a still sadder one, for after a life of failure and misfortune he was murdered in his flight before his own barons. James IV. fell in the disastrous fight at Flodden Field, leaving his crown to a babe of two years old. James V., the last, as Mrs. Oliphant calls him, of the heroic age, died of grief for the disappointment of his hopes and the loss of his army on Solway Moss.

Of these five kings, who all of them bore the name with a certain lustre, there can be no doubt that James I. was at once the noblest man and the most enlightened and accomplished prince. Seldom, indeed, has so fine a character or so stainless a life been seen in that fierce light which beats upon a throne. The romance of his youth adds to the interest which he inspires. At the age of twelve he was sent out of the kingdom by his poor old father, King Robert, who had already seen one son murdered by his ambitious uncle the Regent

Albany, and dreaded lest James should share the same fate. But on its way to France the ship in which the young prince sailed fell into the hands of the English foe, and James was taken a prisoner to Windsor Castle. Fortunately for him the education which he received in his captivity was a better one than he would have had at home. Henry IV. and Henry V., the English kings who kept him so long from his throne, could not have done more for him in this respect if he had been a prince of their own blood. His old father died within a year of the cruel blow which robbed him of his last remaining son, but it was not until after the death of his uncle, the Regent Albany, that the new monarch set foot in his kingdom. Meanwhile he grew up a handsome and accomplished prince, trained in all knightly exercises and taking especial delight in the Canterbury Tales of the great father of English poetry, whose example he was soon to follow. And one May morning, as he stood at his window 'in the castled keep of Windsor,' and saw the King of England's fair daughter Joan walking among the blossoms and trees of the garden, the spring of love and poetry dawned in his heart. Then he sang those sweet and tender strains of the golden morning breaking on the castle heights, of the spring with its flowers, bird voices, and fluttering leaves, and of her who was 'the fairest and the sweeteste yonge flow'r of all.' And when at length the day of his release came, and he once more returned to his native land, he took the fair English princess with him as his bride, in all the splendour of her royal robes, and wearing the ruby on her white throat, as he had sung. The entry of the princely pair was a great day for old Edinburgh. The people were tired, as they well might be, of the long regency of the dreaded Albany. Years had passed since the loyal citizens had gazed on their king's face, and now here was a young and knightly monarch, himself the flower of chivalry, the most gracious and courteous of men, with a fair and royal bride, come back to dwell among them. Well might the narrow streets be thronged that day with 'country folk in homespun, and ladies in French hoods,' and eager crowds impatient to see their king and watch the long procession wind down the long ridge from the Castle gates to the doors of Holyrood. But the day which had dawned so brightly was to close in tears and blood. 'Maist happy,' Henry V. of England had said of his royal brother-in-law, 'maist happy people shall they be that happens to get you noble man to their prince.' And his prophecy was not wrong. James made an excellent king, bent on maintaining order, eager to help

the restriction of the company of th

I

me the up aft we fel

fo

de

car bea Sco two His the blo the value The

tive v

por

a de

1891

e fate. prince es was im the ter one nry V., throne, he had within emaincle, the s kingplished

especial f Eng-And castled aughter garden, hen he norning flowers, as 'the vhen at eturned ith him d weare entry h. The regency e loyal e was a

ght the folk in wds imon wind doors of htly was

man to nes made to help

hivalry, nd royal ry V. of st happy the poor and listen to the suppliant's prayer, 'to ride abroad, redressing human wrong' as a true knight of God. But the times were too hard for him. The turbulent chiefs would not obey the law, and James had to break their power before he could carry out his reforms. So his thirteen years' reign proved one long struggle with desperate men, who recked little of the established order and were ready at any moment to defy their king's authority. And in the end this noble and generous prince fell a victim to the storm which he himself had The story of that awful tragedy is well known. It forms the subject of one of the finest of modern ballads.1 Every detail is given there—how the king, after spending Christmas merrily in the Black Friars convent at Perth, was making music alone with the Queen and her ladies one evening, when the sound of trampling feet and angry voices broke suddenly upon them, and a band of armed men rushed in; and how, after a desperate struggle, in which the Queen herself was wounded and Catherine Douglas had her arm broken, James fell pierced with sixteen wounds.

> 'Last she stood up to her queenly height; But she shook like an autumn leaf, As though the fire wherein she burned Then left her body and all were turned To winter of life-long grief; And "Oh, James!" she said, "My James!" she said. Alas! for the woful thing That a poet true and a friend of man In desperate days of bale and ban Should needs be born a king!'

Even if James I. had not been born a king he would, there can be no doubt, have won fame as a poet; for, besides the beautiful love song of the King's 'Quhair,' after his return to Scotland he showed the versatility of his genius by writing two other remarkable poems of a totally different character. His 'Peblis to the Play 'and 'Christis Kirk on the Green,' with their clumsy clowns and merry lasses in gay kirtles, their bagpipes blowing at the village feast, and Hob and Raaf'daffing,' breathe the very essence of rustic enjoyment, and are of the utmost value as contemporary pictures of country life in Scotland. There can hardly be two opinions as to the character and genius of James I., but we are not sure that Mrs. Oliphant's portrait of James IV. is not painted in colours of too glowing a description. His personality is no doubt singularly attractive. That he was a veritable knight of romance, and that

1 Dante Rossetti's King's Tragedy.

VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

345

h

p

li

h

al

ki

lif

bo

ha

the

un

de

late

roi

wit

Th

wh swa

Ch

kin

Th

Sco

ing

pur

the

wor

ang

thar

esqu

and

mor

and

which

the !

But

proc

men

clima

or de

the heroism of his death goes far to atone for his rashness and folly, no one will dispute. His Court was the most splendid ever held by Scottish king, and under his rule, according to Mrs. Oliphant, Scotland attained a degree of wealth and prosperity which she had never enjoyed before. But his false idea of chivalry wrought his own downfall and brought his country to the verge of ruin. When a message came from Queen Anne of France, who sent him a turquoise ring and bade him as her true knight ride three miles on English ground and break three lances for her sake, James took up the challenge at once, and not all the warnings he received could alter his purpose. Vainly the aged hermit started up out of the crowd with his heaven-sent word of warning as the King knelt at Mass in Linlithgow Cathedral; vainly the ghostly herald was heard in the streets of Edinburgh at the dead of night summoning the nobles of the land by name to appear before the grim tribunal of death. Nothing could arrest the King's madness. 'He is not a good captain,' the Spanish grandee Don Pedro d'Ayala had written of him in his letters home, 'because he begins to fight before he has given his orders . . . nor does he think it right to begin any warlike undertaking without being himself the first in danger.' And he proved the truth of these words on that fatal field where he paid for his folly and his rashness by dying sword in hand, surrounded by his proudest nobles, in the front of the battle.

'No one failed him! He is keeping Royal state and semblance still; Knight and noble lie around him Cold on Flodden's fatal hill.'

Mrs. Oliphant only glances briefly at that disastrous fight, which made so profound an impression on the heart of Scotland, but she gives a forcible description of the dismay and gloom in Edinburgh when the news arrived and the city woke to a sense of the terrible loss which it had sustained. The dark hour passed away, and the English victors never came to storm the walls of the Maiden city; but the memory of that moment lives in the contemporary records and in the noblest of Professor Aytoun's lays. With the death of James V., the son and successor of him who fell at Flodden, the Stuart kings of Scotland come to an end. When that unfortunate monarch lay dying of a broken heart for the loss of his army and the failure of all his hopes, the news came that his queen

¹ Edinburgh after Flodden, by Professor W. Aytoun.

hness most rule, ree of before. ll and essage quoise les on James ngs he hermit ord of nedral; nburgh and by Vothing aptain, of him he has gin any danger.' tal field g sword

front of

July

ous fight, of Scotmay and city woke ed. The r came to ry of that he noblest es V., the he Stuart fortunate his army his queen had borne him 'a faire dochter.' '" Farewell," the King replied sadly. "It came with ane lass and it will pass with ane lass," and so commended himself to Almighty God, and spoke little from thenceforth, but turned his back to his lords and his face to the wall' (p. 235). And his words came true, although not in the sense in which he meant them; for Scotland once united to England was no longer the same kingdom. Her separate existence was merged in a larger life, and the Stuarts who reigned over them were eventually borne down by the force of a mightier current which they had not the power to stem.

'The Stewards of Scotland,' says Mrs. Oliphant, 'here ended their special trust and gave in their account. No race was ever more unfortunate, but I think we may say that none more nobly endeavoured to discharge that high commission. . . . They were noble gentlemen one and all; the bigotry, the egotism, the obstinacy of the later Stewarts were not in them. Knights and paladins of an age of romance, they were also stern executors of justice, bold innovators, with eyes ever open to every expedient of progress and prosperity. Their faults were those of a light heart and genial temperament, which are the most easily understood and pardoned. Under their sway their country and their little capital came to be known over Christendom as not unworthy to hold place among the reigning kingdoms and cities through which the stream of chivalry flowed. They invented the trade, the shipping, the laws and civic order of Scotland. Among her heroes there is none more worthy of everlasting remembrance. They fulfilled their stewardry with a unity of purpose and a steadfastness of aim which, when we take into account the continually recurring lapses of long minorities, is one of the wonders of the time. Edinburgh grew under their sway from an angry village, lying between a fierce castle and a rich monastery, little distinguished above its peers, less favoured than Stirling, less wealthy than the town of St. John, to one of the most noted of cities, picturesque and splendid, full of noble houses, the centre of national life and government. And it is curious to record that no one of the monarchs who brought it such nobility and fame left any sadness of death to the associations of Edinburgh. They lived and were wedded, and filled with the brightness of their happier moments the town which afforded so beautiful a scene for all rejoicings; they died on the field of battle or in other places in conflict or violence or despair. But Edinburgh only retains the brighter memories, the triumphal processions, the bridal finery, the jousts and the feasts, the parliaments and proclamations of law and high alliances. The reigns of the Jameses contain the history of her rise, her splendour, her climax of beauty and stateliness, without any association of downfall or decay ' (p. 238).

'The Time of the Prophets' is the title of Mrs. Oliphant's

n

SI

S

th

d

n

SC

in

th

in

ar

ob

no sel

of

ha

pro

Ol

ste

wh

ave

Bu

MI

no

third chapter, and, as the name implies, John Knox here plays the foremost part in the drama. The author's own sympathies are, it is plain, strongly on the side of the fiery reformer; but, with all her admiration for his zeal and boldness, even she cannot always justify the violence of his character and the vindictiveness of his conduct. Of all fanatics Knox was the most absolutely unreasonable and impracticable. It is impossible to overlook the fact that to him is owing the wholesale destruction and plunder of abbeys and churches effected by the rabble whom his fierce oratory first roused to action. He himself gloried in these acts of vandalism, and loudly proclaimed his satisfaction when 'nothing but bare walls—yea, not so much as door or windows—were left.' In Mrs. Oliphant's words—

'Knox was too much intent on setting Scotland loose from all previous traditions—from the past, which was idolatrous and corrupt, and in which till it reached to the age of the Apostles he recognized no good thing—to be concerned about the temples of Baal. Scottish history, Scottish art were corrupted too . . . and though he was himself the most complete incarnation of Scottish vehemence, dogmatism, national pride, and fiery feeling he was indifferent to their national records' (p. 263).

In the same way the state of anarchy which followed, and the civil strife in which the unhappy country was torn before ever Mary Stuart set foot in Scotland, were mainly brought about by his intemperate action. Neither can we forgive the brutality of his conduct to the unfortunate Mary of Guise, the foreign Queen-mother who had so difficult a part to play, and who all through the period of her regency, as Mrs. Oliphant owns, did her utmost to keep the peace and avoid bloodshed and violence. At least the implacable reformer might have found a gentler prayer than that which he uttered over the poor Queen's grave: 'God for His good mercy's sake rid us from the rest of the Guisian blood.' But the quality of mercy did not enter into John Knox's character. however, is the final verdict which Mrs. Oliphant pronounces upon the great Scottish reformer and his work, a verdict which is on the whole admirably just and discriminating:-

'If steadfast adherence to what he thought the perfect way, if the most earnest purpose, the most unwearying labour, the profoundest devotion to his God and his country are enough to constitute greatness, John Knox is great He was at the same time a man all faults—bristling with prejudices, violent in speech, often merciless in judgment, narrow, dogmatic, fiercely intolerant. He was incapable of that crowning grace of the imagination and heart k here
s own
he fiery
h boldof his
Of all
he and
that to
abbeys
oratory
acts of
when
hoor or

July

from all corrupt, cognized Scottish he was nce, dogto their

red, and n before brought give the of Guise, to play, as Mrs. nd avoid er might ered over sake rid uality of r. This, onounces a verdict ting:-

ect way, if the progh to conme time a ecch, often rant. He and heart which enables a man to put himself in another's place and do as he would be done by. . . . A perfectly dauntless nature, fearing nothing, the self-confidence of an inspired prophet, the high tyrannical impulse of a swift and fiery genius impatient of lesser spirits, were all in him, making of him the imperative, absolute, arrogant autocrat he was; but yet no higher ambition, no more noble purpose ever inspired a man. He desired for his countrymen that they should be a chosen people, like those of old whom God had selected to receive His revelation; his ambition was to make Scotland the most pure, the most godlike of all countries of the earth. In many things he was intolerable, in some he was wrong and self-deceived. . . . If he transmitted many great qualities to his country he also transmitted the defects of those qualities. . . . He gained for his race a great freedom, which cannot be justly called religious freedom, because it was, in his intention at least, freedom to follow their own way, with none at all for those who differed from them. He set up a high standard of piety and probity, and for once made the business of the soul, the worship of God and study of His laws, the most absorbing of public interests. He thrilled the whole country through and through with the inspiration of a fervent spirit, uncompromising in its devotion to the truth, asking no indulgence if also, perhaps, giving none, serving God in his own way with a fidelity above every bribe, scornful of every compromise. But he cut Scotland adrift so far as in him lay from the brotherhood of habit and tradition, from the communion, if not of saints, yet of many saintly uses and much that is beautiful in Christian life. He made his country eminent, and secured for her one great chapter in the history of the world; but he imprinted upon her a certain narrowness uncongenial to her character and to her part, which has undervalued her to many superficial observers, and done perhaps a little, but a permanent, harm to her national ideal ever since. He taught her to exult in that disruption, not to regret it; and he left an almost ineradicable conviction of self-superiority to a world lying in wickedness in the innermost heart of a nation. It is a wonderful testimony to a man that he should have thus been able to imprint his own characteristics upon his race; and no doubt it is because he was himself of the very quintessence of its national character to start with that he has maintained this prodigious power through these three hundred years ' (p. 347).

In the next and by far the most difficult portion of her task, the oft-disputed history of Mary, Queen of Scots, Mrs. Oliphant shows her accustomed tact and moderation. She steers her way skilfully through the quicksands and shoals which beset her course, and endeavours as far as possible to avoid expressions of strong partisanship with either side. But whether we agree with Mr. Shelton in considering Mary to have been more 'sinned against than sinning,' or with Mr. Froude in holding her guilty of the blackest crime, it is not in human nature to refuse our pity to the bright young

queen in these early days of her reign. Here we see her once more in that fair spring-time, full of hope and joy, anxious to make her subjects happy, eager to conciliate all, even the grim-faced minister who called all Papists infidels and denounced her from the pulpit as a woman of sin, 'the mischievous Marie.' Her very courage in confronting him, and in daring to hold fast to her own faith in the teeth of such tremendous opposition, cannot but excite our admiration and command our respect.

'Had Mary deserted her faith, as it would have been such admirable policy to do; had she said, like the great Henry, that Scotland was well worth a Mass or the sacrifice of a Mass, would posterity have thought the better of her? Certainly it would not; but Knox would, and her path would have been a thousand times more clear' (p. 313).

And although it may be true that religion had little to do with the subsequent troubles of Mary's reign, yet there is no doubt that Knox's openly avowed hatred was but part of a secret and powerful conspiracy, instigated and supported by the intrigues of Elizabeth and Cecil, to which the ill-fated queen in the end fell a victim. Mrs. Oliphant prudently reserves her opinion, and does not venture to pronounce Mary guilty or innocent of the crimes which have been imputed to her; but we remark that she holds the genuineness of the Casket Letters to be doubtful, and admits that they were first produced under very suspicious circumstances, at the enquiry into Mary's conduct that was held at York in 1568. She contents herself with describing Edinburgh at this most stirring and picturesque crisis of her history, and points out how the brightest scenes and darkest tragedies of Mary's life are all connected with the ancient city, where almost every old house and gabled roof recalls her name. She goes on to give a sketch of George Buchanan, the scholar of the Reformation and Court poet of Mary's reign, who used to read Livy with the young Queen of an afternoon at Holyrood, and talk to her of the France she loved so well, in the days before her marriage with Darnley, and who, after being loaded with rewards and appointed to the coveted post of Principal of St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews, became one of her bitterest and most violent accusers. Mrs. Oliphant defends him from the accusation originally made by Chalmers of having forged the Casket Letters, but is decidedly less successful in her endeavours to acquit him of ingratitude towards his royal mistress. But the story of his life is pleasantly told, and we have a pretty picture of the last visit paid

fe

t

a

0

h

u

0

la

Ē

Ci

ir

is

th

al

01

re

de

PI

ee her d joy, ate all, nfidels n, 'the g him, eeth of

July

admircotland ity have Knox e clear

to do e is no rt of a ted by ll-fated idently nounce e been enuinets that stances, York in irgh at ry, and edies of almost he goes of the used to t Holyl, in the r being post of became liphant halmers

dly less

ratitude

is plea-

sit paid

him by his learned friends from St. Andrews, who found the old historian sitting in his chair talking quietly of his coming end, and teaching his servant to spell a, b, ab, and e, b, eb, &c.

With this most famous period—the climax, as she calls it, of the national history—Mrs. Oliphant brings her survey of the Edinburgh of the Stuarts to a close. The existence of Edinburgh as a capital ends with the accession of James VI. to the throne of England, and the dramatic interest of the ancient metropolis dies away. Thenceforth the Parliament House and its law courts were the centre of Edinburgh; Holyrood sank into a debtors' sanctuary, the great Cathedral of St. Giles became a mere cluster of parish churches, and instead of crowding round the city cross to hear royal proclamations read by the heralds the citizens met there to talk of the last news from London. But even these changed times had their stirring episodes, and old Edinburgh witnessed more than one scene as dramatic and picturesque as any in the days of old, scenes too that were intimately connected with the fortunes of the Stuart race, and as such deserved a place in the pages of Royal Edinburgh. The author might have told us, for instance, how the great Marquis of Montrose was led out to die for King Charles on the scaffold in the High Street, and how that other gallant Grahame rode through the crowd of angry citizens at the head of his little band of daring soldiers, and up 'to the foot of the Castle steep,' there to hold converse with the gay Gordon. She might have told us how the covenant was signed in that historic churchyard of the Greyfriars, where many a noble Scot is now sleeping his last sleep. Above all, she might have bestowed more than a passing mention on that brilliant moment in the story of Edinburgh when Prince Charles Edward entered the ancient capital, and held his Court after the manner of his forefathers in the palace of Holyrood. The very fact that Mrs. Oliphant is so accomplished a story-teller, and knows so well how to describe scenes of this stirring nature, only makes us regret these omissions the more. But these romantic episodes are all passed over, and instead of them we have three chapters on the men of letters whose names are connected with modern Edinburgh.

No city in Europe has been richer in literary sons during the last two centuries. Certainly none has better recognized the claims of her children to fame or taken greater delight in paying honour to her distinguished men. The monuments of Scott, of Burns, of Dugald Stewart occupy the proudest positions in the town; the statues of Allan Ramsay,

of Professor Wilson, and many others are conspicuous objects in the streets. At every turn some mural tablet arrests the eye and reminds us of some departed worthy who once lived or died, or was a guest within these walls. The quaint little court off the Lawnmarket where Boswell entertained Dr. Johnson, the lodgings where Hume wrote the History of England, the house of Smollett and the home of Adam Smith, the birthplace of Mackenzie, the 'Man of Feeling,' and the burial-place of Robert Ferguson, the house where Lord Brougham was born and where Hugh Miller died, are still to be seen. We can find out the site of the Ambrose Tavern, where the poet Campbell and the Ettrick Shepherd used to meet in the days of the 'Round Table,' sung by Wilson in his Noctes Ambrosianæ, or discover the exact spot where 'Rab' introduced Dr. John Brown to his friends, the carrier and the carrier's horse 'Jess;' and we can, if we will, visit the humble home at Comely Bank to which Carlyle brought his bride-

'my little Jeannie, one of the brightest, cleverest creatures in the whole world; full of innocence, rustic simplicity and vivacity, yet with the gracefullest discernment, calmly natural deportment, instinct with beauty and intelligence to the finger ends.'

From this crowd of celebrities, whose names have made the old capital of the Stuarts illustrious as the modern Athens, Mrs. Oliphant selects three—Allan Ramsay, the Burgher Poet; Robert Burns, the Guest of Edinburgh; and Walter Scott, the Shakespeare of Scotland. Of the three separate chapters which are devoted to these poets that on Allan Ramsay will be the most interesting to English readers. There is nothing fresh to be said of Burns or Sir Walter, but the little wig-maker who became the most popular poet of his day deserves to be better known. Allan Ramsay, the author of the Gentle Shepherd, kept a shop in the High Street, in a house which, although shorn of its gables, is still one of the most picturesque old buildings in this locality, where he made wigs and wrote verses for the amusement of his customers and neighbours. Soon the rhymes which he printed on penny sheets of paper became so popular that he found it profitable to combine book-selling with wig-making. In due course of time he removed his shop to the Luckenbooths—the old block of buildings since cleared away from the lower part of the High Street-gave up wig-making, and took down the Mercury which had been the sign of his shop to set up medallions of Drummond of Hawthornden and of Ben Jonson.

He read of the cess white a shape of

189

bot him whitern and whitern and own

cha

Ra

He

It i

his

tow livis the so a Edi mod soli dul the ami whi last of I

eler

you

1891

objects ests the e lived it little ed Dr. tory of Adam ig,' and e Lord still to

Γavern. ised to son in where carrier ll, visit

in the city, yet instinct

rought

Athens, urgher Walter eparate Allan There e little is day thor of house e most le wigs

rs and penny fitable urse of

block of the n the

ip meonson.

Here he opened the first circulating library in Scotland, and reached the height of his fame by the publication of the Gentle Shepherd. Few poems have been more widely read during the author's lifetime. The book went everywherefound a home in every cottage—and the fat little shopkeeper's name became a household word from one end of Scotland to the other. No doubt the secret of this pastoral drama's success lay in the perfectly faithful representation of rustic life which it contains. Honest Allan had spent his early years as a shepherd on Crawford Moor, in Clydesdale, and although his poetic talents were not of the highest order, this simple, wholesome tale went straight to the people's heart. At least its freshness was not spoilt by aping classical models after the fashion of contemporary bards. 'The wimpling burn' is not called Helicon; the 'heathery braes are not likened to Parnassus.' It is pleasant to know that the shopkeeper poet lived to enjoy his celebrity and reap the reward of his industry. His trade, both as poet and bookseller, prospered so well that he built himself the octagon house on the crest of the Castle Hill, which he called his bird cage, and which the wits of the day termed the Goose Pie. There he spent his last years in ease and comfort, enjoying the beauty of that wide-spreading view which, in the eyes of an Edinburgh citizen, excels all others, and equally satisfied with himself, convinced, as he says in his

In the next chapter Mrs. Oliphant describes the great change which came over Edinburgh between the time of Ramsay's death and the first visit which Burns paid there towards the end of 1786. The royal city had grown tired of living alone upon her rock, and with the increase of population the need of greater space and comfort began to be felt. And so a massive bridge was thrown across the valley, and 'another Edinburgh rose at the feet of the first, a sober, respectable, modern, and square-toed town, with wide streets and buildings solid and strong, a new town of great houses and big houses, dull as only the eighteenth century was capable of making them.' Wealth and comfort, social elegance and intellectual ambition were the characteristics of the modern city, towards which the fashionable world made its way at the close of the last century. Edinburgh was then rapidly attaining the object of her citizens' ambition, and might justly claim to be one of the foremost intellectual centres of the world. The literary element had never been so prominent before. On all sides

own song, 'that I the best and fairest please.'

young men of genius were growing up.

1 P. 438.

in

N

av

alt

m

wl

po

aff

sti

COL

you

nea

for

Th

de

wa

flir

ins

an

Bu

in

Sc

ho

is s

of :

on

Bu

and

me

us

but

und

hou

'A place in which Walter Scott was just emerging from his delightful childhood, in which Jeffrey was a mischievous boy and Henry Brougham a child, could not but be overflowing with hope, especially when we remember all the good company there already-Dugald Stewart, bringing so many fine young gentlemen from England to wonder at the little Scotch capital, and a crowd of Erskines, Hunters, Gregories, Monroes, and Dr. Blair and Dr. Blacklock, and the 'Man of Feeling,' not to speak of those wild and witty old ladies in the Canongate, and the duchesses who still recognized the claims of Edinburgh in its season. To all this excellent company, whose fame and whose talk hung about both the old Edinburgh and the new like the smoke over their roofs, there arrived one spring day a wonderful visitor, in appearance like nothing so much as an honest hill farmer, travelling on foot, his robust shoulders a little bowed with the habit of the plough, his eyes shining as no other eyes in Scotland shone with youth, and genius, and hope. He knew nobody in Edinburgh save an Ayrshire lad like himself, like what everybody up to this time had supposed Robert Burns to be. The difference was that the stranger a little while before had put forth by the aid of a country printer at Kilmarnock a little volume of rustic poetry upon the most unambitious subjects in Westland Scotch, the record of a ploughman's loves and frolics and thoughts. It is something to know that these credentials were enough to rouse the whole of that witty, learned, clever, and all-discerning community, and that this visitor from the hills and fields in a moment found every door open to him, and Modern Athens, never unconscious of its own superiority, and at this moment more deeply aware than usual that it was one of the lights of the earth, at his feet ' (p. 442).

The gratitude which filled the peasant poet's breast at the unexpected warmth of the welcome which he received from the first men and women in the city is recorded in the somewhat artificial address to Edinburgh—

'Thy sons, Edina, social, kind, With open arms the stranger hail'—

and in a far finer poem, the lament on the death of the poet's most generous patron, Lord Glencairn:—

'The bridegroom may forget the bride Was made his wedded wife yestreen; The monarch may forget the crown That on his head an hour has been; The mother may forget the child That smiles sae sweetly on her knee; But I'll remember thee, Glencairn, And a' that thou hast done for me!'

Whether the honourable reception which Burns met with at the hands of the wits and scholars of Edinburgh had a good

MUX

see fame new like onderful farmer, he habit d shone inburgh his time that the country he most ghman's

him, and id at this lights of st at the ed from

at these

learned, from the

e some-

ne poet's

net with

influence on the poet's character is another question. Certainly his second visit to the hospitable metropolis of the North does not form a particularly edifying episode in his life, and we are not sure he would not have done better to keep away from the social and convivial attractions of Edinburgh altogether. The taverns where he scribbled his verses have mostly disappeared now, but the attic window of a house where he lodged in St. James's Square in the new town is still pointed out. There he wrote the letters to the object of his affections, Clorinda, whom he addresses in these impassioned strains from his garret:—

'I am certain I saw you, Clorinda, but you don't look to the proper story for a poet's lodging, where speculation roosted near the sky. I could almost have thrown myself over for very vexation. Why didn't you look higher? It has spoiled my peace for the day. To be so near my charming Clorinda, and to miss her look when it was searching for me!'

The said Clorinda was a Mrs. Maclehose, who had been deserted by her husband, and who lived to boast when she was an old woman that Bobbie Burns had loved her. The flirtation was a vulgar one, but it had at least the merit of inspiring one of the most beautiful love songs that exists in any language.

'Had we never loved sae kindly, Had we never loved sae blindly, Never met or never parted, We had ne'er been broken-hearted.'

But perhaps the most interesting memorial of Burns's presence in Edinburgh is the house where he met the lame boy Walter Scott, at dinner at Professor Adam Ferguson's, in 1786. That house, formerly an imposing mansion known as Sciennes House, from the convent of St. Katherine of Siena close by, is still standing, and retains its stone balustrade, and festoons of fruit and flowers carved in stone, although it now looks out on the paved yard of a back alley. We do not know what Burns thought of the strange boy who had read everything and must know everything, but Sir Walter never forgot that meeting with the Ayrshire poet.

Many are the memories of Scott himself which crowd upon us in Edinburgh. The house where he was born indeed is gone, but a tablet records its site, and 25 George Square, where he spent the greater part of his youth, near the Meadows, is almost unchanged. Still more memorable is 39 Castle Street, the house where he settled soon after his marriage, and where he

W

ta

th

h

al

tr

10

to

ro

b

th

ir

CI

th

ar

ar

W

in

th

tie

spent more than twenty-six years of his life—'dear old 39,' as Lockhart calls it, where so many illustrious guests met and so many famous works were written. This was the beloved home which it cost Scott such a pang to give up in those last sad years when trouble fell so heavily upon him. With all his love for Abbotsford he never forgot that he was an Edinburgh man. Every corner of her streets, every view from her terraces still speaks to us of him. The hills which he climbed as a boy, the scenes which he has sung in so many poems and described in so many passages of his novels are all full of him. To him the old town and the new alike were living with recollections of great men and historic events. 'Not a queer tottering gable,' says Lockhart, 'but recalled to him some long-buried memory of splendour or bloodshed, which by a few words he set before the hearer in the reality of life.' And he has peopled them for us with a whole world of men and women, with names and faces that are as dear and as familiar to us as any who have lived and died there. Jeanie Deans and Flora MacIvor, the Baron, and Guy Mannering !- we cannot walk the streets of Edinburgh, or look up at the Castle Rock, without remembering them. And yet, after all, the man himself who made Scotland and the world so rich was, in Mrs. Oliphant's words, 'himself the finest revelation of all' (p. 476). The journal of those last six years of his life, which has lately been published, has strengthened and confirmed the impression which Lockhart's biography of his father-in-law had already given. There we see the great novelist with a courage and nobleness beyond all praise quietly setting to work to stem the flood of ruin which had overtaken his publishers, and in which he found himself so heavily involved. We know how bravely he accomplished that tremendous task, and how steadfastly he worked on, conscious of failing powers and declining health, simply because he was determined that no one who had trusted him should suffer on his account. The heroism of his self-sacrifice, the terrible strain which brought his days to an untimely end, has crowned that marvellously successful career with singular pathos, and endeared Sir Walter to us in a way that nothing else could have done.

Mrs. Oliphant alludes to Carlyle as the one great Scotchman who failed to appreciate Sir Walter, and suggests that it may have been the universal consent of applause which awoke the germ of perversity in his rugged peasant nature. But there is more than this in Carlyle's estimate of Scott. The author of Sartor Resartus and Past and Present had in his heart a supreme contempt for romance, and the great magician was

July in his eyes a mere story-teller, 'a strong, healthy man,' but 39, as one who had no great message for his times, no balm for and so weary souls, no word of hope for failing hearts. And it is d home curious to notice how in this Carlyle was but the forerunner of d years the new age. The young critics of the present day are just ove for as impatient, just as scornful of mere story-telling, and despise h man. Scott as ignorant and antiquated, because he is content to tell his ces still tale and does not trouble himself to solve any of the problems ooy, the that vex the modern mind. But if Carlyle will not allow ed in so Scott to be a great writer his sympathy for the man gets the him the better of his critical judgment in the end. No words which tions of he ever wrote are more touching than the final passage in g gable,' his well-known review of Lockhart's Life of Scott :nemory t before d them nes and no have

'It can be said of him when he departed he took a man's life along with him. No sounder piece of manhood was put together in that eighteenth century of time. Alas! his fine Scotch face'-that face which speaks to us so powerfully in Raeburn's noble portrait-'with its shaggy honesty, sagacity, and goodness, when we saw it latterly on the Edinburgh streets, was all worn with care, the joy all fled from it, ploughed deep with labour and sorrow. We shall never forget it. We shall never see it again. Adieu, Sir Walter, pride of all Scotchmen; take our proud and sad farewell.'

With the name of this great Scotchman, who has done more than any other to spread the knowledge of Scottish history and of the Scottish character into all parts of the civilized world, Mrs. Oliphant fitly ends her record of Royal Edinburgh, royal alike in the bygone age of her native kings and in the brilliant reign of modern literature and poetry.

'Seated on the rocks which are more old than any history, though those precipices are now veiled with verdure and softness, and the iron way of triumphant modern science runs at their feet; with their crown of sacred architecture hanging over her among the mists, and the little primeval shrine mounted upon her highest ridge; with her palace, all too small for the requirements of an enlarged and splendid royalty, and the great crouched and dormant sentinel of nature watching over her through all the centuries; with her partner, sober and ample, like a comely matron, attended by all the modern arts and comforts, seated at the old mother's feet-Edinburgh can never be less than royal, one of the crowned and queenly cities of the world. It does not need for this distinction that there should be millions of inhabitants within her walls, or all the great threads of industry and wealth gathered in her hands. The pathos of much that is past and over for ever, the awe of many tragedies, a recollection, almost more true than any reality of the present, of ages and glories gone—add a charm which the wealthiest and greatest interests of to-day cannot give, to the city, always living, always stirring, where

ch awoke But there he author s heart a ician was

vor, the

reets of

nember-

o made

's words,

journal

en pub-

n which

ly given.

obleness

flood of vhich he

avely he

fastly he

g health, who had

sm of his

ys to an

ful career

in a way

t Scotch-

ts that it

m

as

th

tr

CC

th

D

of al

in

ca

in

re

no

ho

ho

by

as

of

tea

SC

m

SO

in

Wa

SO

lat

ac

ari

Le

Ca

als

Aı

Ge

she stands amid traditionary smoke and mist, the grey metropolis of the north, the Edinburgh of a thousand fond associations,

'Our Own Romantic Town' (p. 486).

ART. IV.—SCARTAZZINI'S PROLEGOMENI ON DANTE.

Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia. Introduzione allo Studio di Dante Alighieri e delle sue Opere. Per G. A. SCARTAZZINI. (Leipzig, 1890.)

THIS volume completes the author's celebrated edition of the Divina Commedia. It has been long expected. As he reminds us in the preface, he had in 1875, when publishing the Purgatorio, expressed the hope that the whole work would be completed within the next three years. But the three became fifteen, to the great advantage, we venture to think, of the reader. We must own to a feeling of relief and satisfaction when, instead of the expected bulky life of Dante, plus a lengthy history of his age with special reference to events alluded to in the *Poema Sacro*, and plus a voluminous series of dissertations on different important passages in the Divina Commedia, modelled on those concerning the 'Matilda' and the 'Veltro' in the volume containing the Purgatorio, we found a book of reasonable compass, limited to its proper office as an introduction to the study of the poet and his works, though also fraught with matter—the quintessence, as the author says, of more than a quarter of a century's indefatigable labours—which cannot but redound to the profit of students who have long been versed in both. The courage with which Dr. Scartazzini has put aside much of the material which he tells us that he had in the first instance prepared for this book, and his discernment in recognizing that it will find a fitter place in his contemplated second edition of the volumes containing the commentary, will, we are convinced, greatly increase the number of those who will read the present volume from cover to cover instead of dipping into it as the mere book of reference which it would have become if written on the lines originally intended. Any one who has essayed the continuous perusal of the former volumes, especially those devoted to the Purgatorio and the Paradiso respectively, will know what we mean. They are encyclopædias rather than text-books, polis of

ON

r G. A.

of the he reolishing e work But the ture to lief and Dante, o events series of Divina and the found a ce as an ugh also says, of -which ong been zzini has e had in ernment contemhe comnumber cover to reference riginally

s perusal

the Pur-

what we

kt-books,

marvellous in their store of vast and polyglot erudition astounding as being the work of one man. But though we think them an inestimable boon, we do not often disturb their repose upon our shelves without pressing occasion for

so doing.

1891

To return to the *Prolegomeni*, the first—the historical—part treats (a) of the external vicissitudes of Dante's life (1) in his country, and (2) in exile; (b) of his inner life. Stress is laid throughout this upon the little that we know historically of any of the facts about him which have been handed down to The reader will be struck by the resolute agnosticism of Dr. Scartazzini as to everything that cannot be vouched for out of the poet's own writings. He rejects the early biographies, and all which have followed their assertions—his own youthful work in German included—as so many untrustworthy romances. He denies that Dante's ancestors were noble, and even finds cause for doubt as to the poet's having been born at Florence. in his own suspiciously-repeated assertions to that effect. He reminds us that nothing is known, and that Dante tells us nothing, of his father, mother, or brothers; his childhood or his home education; his own family, wife, and children. The same holds true of his studies. Boccaccio's rhetorical account of them is utterly false. The truth, to be gathered from hints dropped by Dante himself, is that he can hardly have studied as a boy the arts of the trivium and quadrivium; that nothing said by him to Brunetto Latini in Inf. xv. 82 &c. warrants the assertion that the latter was his instructor, in the usual sense of the word; nor could Brunetto have had any time for so teaching him; that as a youth he can hardly have been at school, still less at a university; and that his accomplishments were limited at twenty-five to a smattering of Latin. some knowledge in composing rhymes, and some proficiency in drawing. Of philosophy, theology, and other sciences he was then wholly as ignorant as he always was of Greek. His so-called scientific journeys must be referred to a date later than his exile. With musicians he may have been acquainted, but not with music. Passing to his deeds of arms, Dr. Scartazzini on the whole does believe the biographer Leonardo Bruni's assertion that he was at the battle of Campaldino on June 11, 1289, and thinks the letter from Dante on the matter, quoted by Leonardo, authentic. He also believes that the poet was at the siege of Caprona in August of the same year (Inf. xxi. 94-96).

As to his family life, it is historical fact that he married Gemma Donati, and had by her two sons, Pietro and Jacopo,

a

n

fa

W

C

b

hi

st

of

m

-to

of

13

an

tu

Sc

tol

cee

13

Pa

the

Oc

are

and

apo

ject

of his

tha

ing

tak

a jo

and two daughters, Beatrice and Antonia. When this marriage took place is unknown, but probably it was between 1295 and 1298. Boccaccio's statements (a) that it was made up for Dante by his relatives, and (b) that it turned out unhappily, are rejected as baseless fictions. Those who are curious to master the pros and cons as to the happiness or the reverse of Dante's married life will find them marshalled at pp. 47-50. For ourselves, it has always seemed to us difficult to reconcile the admitted fact, that from the time of his exile down to the end of his life Dante never saw his wife again, with the assumption that there was no breach between them. Dr. Scartazzini's arguments on this point do not convince us. He himself, too (pp. 148, 149), seems pressed by the difficulty of accounting, on that hypothesis, for the fact that Gemma, who survived the poet, did not join him in his last refuge at Ravenna, especially as his children, Pietro and Beatrice, and probably also Jacopo, came there to spend with him the last years of his life.1

Next, we come to the public life of Dante. This lasted in all for only six years (1295 or 1296 to the beginning of 1302), which fact alone disposes of the mendacious statement of Filelfo that he was sent by the State on fourteen different embassies. The generalities of Boccaccio and the brief statements of Villani are of no assistance in determining what his public career amounted to. His intimacy at Florence with Charles Martel in 1294 seems to point to his having then acquired some political standing; for he had as yet no sufficient political reputation to recommend him to the prince. It is known that, as the 'Ordinances of Justice' required of aspirants to civil employment, he enrolled himself (probably in 1296) in one of the Art Guilds, choosing that of the doctors and apothecaries. It is on record that on December 10, 1296, and again on March 14, 1297, he took part as a member in the debates of the Council of a Hundred. Doubtful as is his alleged embassy in May 1299 to the commune of San Gemignano, his priorate from June 15 to August 15, 1300, is indubitable. To this he himself ascribed all his subsequent misfortunes. Dr. Scartazzini agrees with Todeschini that it was no great honour,

¹ One of the passages from the Divina Commedia cited as a proof that Dante was unhappy with his wife is Par. xiv. 61-6, where the blest are supposed to express desire to see again their fathers and mothers, but Dante says nothing of their wives. Dr. Scartazzini retorts that neither does he mention their husbands. The amusing comment of Dr. Moore (Dante's Early Biographers, p. 18) upon this is that the blest in question were all learned theologians, and of course, as such, unmarried ecclesiastics. But he forgets that Solomon was one of them.

July rriage 5 and up for appily, ous to everse at pp. ifficult s exile again, them. nce us. fficulty emma, fuge at

ce, and

he last sted in 1302), nent of ifferent f statehat his ce with g then ifficient . It is pirants 296) in apothed again bates of mbassy priorate this he r. Scarhonour,

s a proof the blest thers, but at neither or. Moore question d ecclesias six Priors and a Gonfaloniere were elected every two months, so that forty-two held office in a year. None of the names of Dante's colleagues are those of members of noble families. He disclaims for the poet the credit of impartiality which has been given him for having banished, among the heads of the Bianchi and Neri factions, his great friend Guido Cavalcanti; because this banishment did not occur till December 1300, when the poet had been out of office four months. Some repute for architectural knowledge may have procured his selection in April 1301 to preside over the widening, straightening, and repair of a street in Florence, and the pulling down of a house which obstructed this improvement. Two other brief notices of his having thrice attended the Council in this same year bring his known public services to a close.

The conclusions of Dr. Scartazzini as to the circumstances of his exile, and his movements during it, may be thus summarized: It is untrue that he had been sent on an embassy to Boniface VIII., and was absent upon it when the decrees of exile were pronounced against him in January and March 1302. He was at Florence when summoned to appear and pay the fine imposed, but fled (probably with Viero de' Cerchi and the other Bianchi leaders), and was condemned for contumacy. He finally left his companions in misfortune early in 1303, going to Verona to the court of Bartolommeo della Scala, the 'Gran Lombardo' of Par. xvii. 71. After Bartolommeo's death in 1304 he may be supposed to have proceeded to Bologna, and to have remained there till March 1306, when the Bianchi were by decree expelled from it. Padua was his next refuge. There is documentary proof that he was domiciled there in August 1306, and that he was in the Lunigiana with the Marchesi Malaspina in the following October. For some two years from that time his movements are unknown; but his alleged second visit to the Lunigiana, and the letter relating to it attributed to Fra Ilario, are apocryphal. It is certain that he visited Paris—we may conjecture in 1308 or 1309—and he probably went there by way of Verona, to see Can Grande. We are not to suppose that his wanderings extended into other parts of France; still less that he ever went to Oxford, or to England at all. According to Serravalle he was without sufficient funds in Paris to take the degree there of Doctor of Theology, for which he had qualified. If so, how could he have afforded the cost of a journey to England?

It is Dr. Scartazzini's belief that Dante went to the three VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

B B

th

n

at

th

bi

st

D

th

cr

ta

ha

Ra

joi

Ja

ac

Th

cre

Ra

tor

ser

ret

Th

que

Th

for

birt

life

pos

tha

seri

the

solu

writ

to d

taki

We

leng

Universities—Bologna, Padua, and Paris—not as a student, but as a lecturer and teacher; and that he did this, not merely because he had then nothing to learn, but from the

necessity of supporting himself.

While Dante was in Paris, viz. on January 5, 1309, the Emperor Henry VII. was crowned. He did not, however, come down into Italy until September 1310. Dante's ardent hopes from this long-expected deliverer of his country doubtless induced him to return thither at this time. It is certain that he was in Italy at the end of 1310 or beginning of 1311. Internal evidence proves that his celebrated letter to the princes and peoples of Italy was written about the beginning of the Emperor's doings there. Dr. Scartazzini doubts, but will not deny, the genuineness of this document. If authentic, its contents show that Dante had, before writing it, been to do homage to the Emperor. On March 31, 1311, he wrote his virulent letter to the Florentines, followed up on April 16 by that to the Emperor, written from the sources of the Arno, in Tuscany. This letter caused Dante to be excepted from the amnesty granted by the reform of Baldo d' Aguglione of September 2, 1311; when, instead, the sen-

tence passed on him in 1302 was confirmed.

From 1311 to the death of the Emperor, on August 24, 1313, there is no trace of Dante's whereabouts; nor from that time till 1320 is there any certain account of him. There may be some historical foundation for the tradition that after the Emperor's death he retired to the monastery of Santa Croce di Fonte Avellana; but there is none for the chronologically impossible fiction that in 1314 he was at Venice as ambassador from Guido da Polenta of Ravenna, and wrote him from thence the apocryphal letter dated March 30 in that year. The sojourn, however, which, as we know from himself, he made at Lucca, must fall somewhere within the period 1314-20; probably between June 1314 and April 1316, during which time his friend Uguccione della Faggiuola was lord of the city. He may also have visited Genoa, Pisa, Gubbio, and Udine. Dante's epistle to the Italian Cardinals, urging them to elect an Italian Pope as successor to Clement V., must have been written between the date of Clement's death (in April 1314) and that of the election of John XXII. (August 7, 1316). On November 6, 1315, a fresh sentence, dooming him to decapitation, was pronounced at Florence against Dante; and his sons were now included in it. This fact alone renders doubtful Boccaccio's account of the proffered amnesty of 1316, under which the

XUM

udent. is, not m the

og, the wever. ardent doubtcertain ing of etter to the bertazzini cument. writing 1, 1311, d up on urces of to be f Baldo

he sen-

gust 24, om that There nat after f Santa chronoenice as d wrote in that himself, e period il 1316, uola was oa, Pisa, ian Carcessor to date of ection of 1315, a vas provere now

occaccio's

hich the

poet might have returned to his country on condition of walking in penance through the streets and paying a fine. His well-known letter to a Florentine friend, scornfully refusing to avail himself of this offer, is probably also unauthentic, vouched for as it is by no one but Boccaccio, and existing as it does in but one Laurentian Codice. Most significant is Dante's own absolute silence about this supposed

permission to return.

To approximate to the time of his taking up his abode at Ravenna, destined to be his last, we have to remember that Boccaccio describes it as lasting several years. The old biographer is more to be trusted with respect to his Ravenna statements than to others, as he had connections there. Dante cannot have gone there at Guido's invitation till after the latter became lord of the place in 1316. Though some critics delay the poet's arrival till 1319 or 1320, Dr. Scartazzini would put it in 1316 or 1317, and thinks that he may have paid a second visit to Can Grande at Verona from Ravenna and returned thither from it. At Ravenna he was joined by his children Pietro and Beatrice, and probably also Jacopo. We have already said that our author is unable to account for their mother Gemma's failure to accompany them. They remained with their father till his death. We may credit Boccaccio's assertion that he occupied his time at Ravenna in taking pupils in poetry, especially in the vulgar tongue. It may or may not be true that he was ultimately sent as ambassador from Guido to Venice, and caught on his return the fever from which he died on September 14, 1321. The doubts which overshadow his last years also attend the question as to the vicissitudes which his remains underwent. They still rest at Ravenna, Florence having in vain petitioned for their cession to her on the sixth centenary of the poet's birth-1865.

Our author next approaches the consideration of the inner life of Dante. What manner of man the poet was is a subject possessing far more interest for his admirers and students than that of his fortunes. It is, as Dr. Scartazzini remarks, a serious task to attempt to fathom so great a character; and the difficulty is enhanced by the necessity for finding the solution in the revelations of himself scattered over his own writings. These are the only authentic sources from which to draw conclusions, but in consulting them there is danger of taking for fact much that is ideal or allegorical, and vice versa. We shall run through the conclusions of Dr. Scartazzini at some

length, because we find in them much that is original.

Dante's inner life dates from the time of his first meeting with Beatrice, he being then at the close of his ninth year and she a child of eight. The mere sight of her began in him a regeneration (Vita Nuova); and the influence which she had upon his life ceased only with his latest breath. His pure and exalted affection for her kept him, at all events during her lifetime, without spot or blemish, and remained after her death his abiding solace. To hold, with Bartoli, Renier, and others, that she was not a real person, but either an abstract feminine ideal or a symbol of Theology, Philosophy, some lofty Virtue, or what not, appears to Dr. Scartazzini, as we are persuaded that it always will to the great majority of those who study the Vita Nuova, simply preposterous. To our thinking, he devotes far more space than they deserve to the refutation of these Idealists: carefully going through the Vita Nuova down to § 29, which records the death of Beatrice, and laying particular stress on his analysis of the celebrated Canzone in § 19, Donne, ch' avete intelletto d' amore. We may dismiss this part of the subject by asking the Idealists, with Torri,1 these few questions:-If Beatrice is Philosophy, or a political idea, what is the meaning (in the Vita Nuova) of making her born in Florence? Who is her companion who died in youth? Who is her father, whose death is recorded in the Vita Nuova? And what is the signification of her own death, also there recorded? To which we may add, Who is her brother, who requested Dante, after her death, to write a sonnet in her praise?² These are but a few out of the many inseparable difficulties in the way of those who deny to Dante's gentilissima donna a form of flesh and blood.

We pass, therefore, to another problem raised by Dr. Scartazzini, not now for the first time, as he published it in 1883 in a Syracusan newspaper. It is this: Was the Beatrice beloved by Dante the daughter of Folco Portinari, and married to Simone de' Bardi? He answers this decidedly in the negative. Inasmuch as 'questa è ad udir sì cosa nuova,' we give in detail an abstract of the reasons which lead him to that conclusion. There is, he says, the initial difficulty as to whether Beatrice was the real name of Dante's lady, since the poet in § 2 of the Vita Nuova says only that his lady was so called by many i quali non sapeano che sì chianare. He does not, however, lay much stress upon this, as he agrees with D'Ancona and others in regarding these

2 Vita Nuova, § 33.

E

h

m

b

gi

ti

B

ha

no

th

ex

pa

di

hii

Va Sc

tha

¹ Apud D'Ancona, ed. 2 of the Vita Nuova, p. xlii. note 2.

eeting ar and him a ch she . His events mained Bartoli, t either eology, to Dr. to the simply e space : care-, which r stress Donne, t of the w queswhat is born in 1? Who Nuova? there reer, who t in her eparable 's genti-

by Dr. hed it in the Beanari, and decidedly sì cosa ns which he initial of Dante's only that two che sì upon this, ing these te 2.

words as intended to explain that those who uttered the name failed to realise how truly appropriate it was. force, he says, is due to the remark of D'Ancona (Vita Nuova, and edit. p. 77), that there is not the least hint in all Dante's works of the marriage of his Beatrice, and that in the parts of the Vita Nuova relating to the time when Folco Portinari's daughter must have been married, there are indications of quarrels, peacemakings, and other matters occurring between Dante and Beatrice, such as those of which the life of lovers is made up. But the formulated reasons adduced by Dr. Scartazzini are as follows: (1) Dante says (Vita Nuova, § 2) that he never set eyes on Beatrice till he was almost nine years old. How could this be if she was Beatrice Portinari; since the Portinari family lived not more than fifty paces from the Alighieri. (2) In the same section he says that between his ninth and eighteenth years he frequently went in search of his lady, and saw her several times. This statement seems to imply that she lived at a distance. In § 3 he tells us that when, at his age of eighteen, Beatrice saluted him, it was the first time he had ever heard her voice. It is impossible that he would not have heard the voice of Beatrice Portinari until he was that age. (3) According to the Vita Nuova, § 10, Beatrice refused Dante her salute, because of his having courted the donna-schermo. At that time Beatrice, Portinari's daughter, was married, and she would therefore have had no motive for anger with the poet on such a ground. (4) To Balbo's assertion that the presence of Dante's Beatrice at the reception of a bride at the bridegroom's house on her marriage day proves that she must have then been married. because none but married women attended on such an occasion, Dr. Scartazzini replies by denying that unmarried girls were excluded. He does not dispute that Beatrice Portinari may have been married before this time. (5) Folco Portinari's will, dated January 15, 1287, refers to his daughter Beatrice as the wife of Simone de' Bardi. If so, she must have been older than Dante's Beatrice, who at that date had not completed her twenty-first year. (6) The language of the Vita Nuova, § 18, in which Beatrice's companion ladies examine Dante as to his love for her, is absolutely incompatible with the possibility of her being then married. (7) It is difficult to see how Dante would have been obliged to praise himself in treating of the death of Beatrice (as he tells us in Vita Nuova, § 29), if she had been another man's wife. Dr. Scartazzini sees in this obscure remark rather an indication that the poet's Beatrice died marriageable but unmarried, and

a

d

Se

acto

pi

lo

Si

D

re

th

CO

hi

tru

qu

aff

MI

of

in

tha

sia

the

bet

ren

rep

not

ces

thinks that the praise of the sonnets scattered over the Vita Nuova is that to which Dante would have been compelled. (8) Dante would never have addressed to the 'principi della terra,' whoever they may have been, a lamentation (Vita Nuova, § 31) for the death of Simone de' Bardi's wife. (9) Nor would Beatrice's brother have asked him (Vita Nuova, § 33) for a poem on the death of another man's wife. (10) Dante's long and openly avowed grief for his lady's death is inconsistent with his not having had, up to her death, the hope of making her his own. (11) His excessive self-reproach (Vita Nuova, §§ 36-40) for having permitted himself after the death of Beatrice to love another is an insoluble enigma if he had done no more than prove unfaithful to the memory of a married woman. (12) If Dante's love was a married woman his affection for her was illicit, and the mere publication of the Vita Nuova, recording it in prose and verse, was an act exceeding even a troubadour's license. And what are we to think of Simone de' Bardi for allowing, without protest, such a slur on his dead wife to be published? (13) In the Convito Dante protests that he never had but one love, Beatrice, and after her death never loved mortal woman, but only Philosophy; and that he would consider himself brought to infamy if any one thought otherwise of him. All this is incompatible with Beatrice's having ever become the wife of another. (14) Beatrice, Inf. ii. 61, speaks of Dante as her 'amico,' and in 1. 72 adds, 'Amor mi mosse, che mi fa parlare.' These words in the mouth of Simone de' Bardi's wife would be a confession of conjugal infidelity. (15) Beatrice's bitter reproaches of Dante, in the last canti of the *Purgatorio*, for his infidelity to her--the literal sense of which cannot be wholly excludedare the words of a woman who had a right to exact fidelity, and to whom the poet was bound to be faithful.

Dr. Scartazzini, admitting that these arguments are not all of equal weight, still regards them, taken together, as destructive of the old tradition which identifies Dante's Beatrice with Beatrice Portinari. He puts aside as valueless the positive testimony to that identity given by Pietro di Dante, the Anonimo Fiorentino, and Boccaccio. Pietro, he says, could not have heard it from his father, and at that time who in Florence would have troubled their heads to inquire who was the lady beloved by a disgraced exile? On the other hand, the informant, vouched by Boccaccio as trustworthy, and a near relation of Beatrice Portinari, would, after the poet's reputation had become established, have had an intelligible

motive for connecting her name with it.

July e Vita pelled. oi della (Vita (9) Nor 2, § 33) Dante's inconnope of 1 (Vita e death he had y of a woman tion of an act e we to st, such Convito ice, and Philoinfamy patible another. ico,' and e words nfession ches of lelity to luded—

e not all destructive with positive nte, the s, could who in who was to hand, or, and a te poet's telligible

fidelity,

We venture to doubt whether our author is not somewhat too confident in regarding his arguments as destructive of the positive statements of Dante's contemporaries, or whether the latter can be so lightly got over. The greater part of the arguments seem to take somewhat too much for granted the hypothesis that such love as is expressed in the Vita Nuova would be derogatory to the character of a married lady, were she the object of it. Professor D'Ancona, in the excellent 'Discorso su Beatrice' which he prefixes to his second edition of that work, points out (pp. xliv-xlvi) that the book contains three different periods and three different phases of affection. In the first we have an affection which, albeit of the purest, has its root and foundation in the realities of life; arises from and maintains itself by the sight of the beloved object; and manifests itself in tears, tremblings, brief joy, intense desire, ardent phrases. The lover in this first stage searches for a bend of the head, a courteous word, a salute; the momentary denial of this salute overwhelms him with grief. But in the second stage the affection becomes by degrees a spiritual adoration of the beloved lady, and the lover resolves in future to confine himself, as the sole end of his love, to recording her praises (Vita Nuova, § 18). And when her death has changed love into a sacred reminiscence and substituted memory for sight, the third stage is reached, and the transfiguration of Beatrice in the poet's imagination, which culminates in the Divina Commedia, begins. In the first stage, Beatrice is a real woman; in the second, a living personification; in the third, an animated symbol in whom are intimately united and conjoined the woman and the personification. Dr. Scartazzini himself points out (p. 198) that the Vita Nuova is, though a true, at the same time a psychological story, and is not unfrequently involved in an allegorical and symbolical dress. Observe, moreover, that even in the earliest stage of his affection the poet expects no more of his lady than her salute. Mr. Symonds, whose extensive acquaintance with the poetry of chivalry gives great weight to his opinions, also points out, in his Introduction to the Study of Dante (2nd ed., p. 258), that the lover in the days of chivalry felt a twofold enthusiasm, which had for its motto 'Dieu et ma Dame.' God was the ultimate object of his adoration, but the lady stood between his soul and God as the visible image and perpetual reminder of heaven. Thus Petrarch and Dante constantly repeat that it was the thought of their lady which had ennobled them and turned their souls to God. Their predecessors the Provençals called the state of feeling generated by

this love joie. It is, Mr. Symonds adds, to be particularly noticed that the chivalrous passion in which it realized itself never ended in marriage; and the lady who inspired it was not unusually a wife. Thus it existed wholly independent of the marriage tie upon the one side and of avowed sensuality upon the other. At the same time it did not in actual life exclude other and less spiritual affections. Dante himself, who is the most luminous example in literature of the chivalrous ecstasy of love, suffered Beatrice to become the wife of another, and married his own wife, Gemma Donati, without for a moment ceasing to adore in Beatrice the mistress of his soul.

At the close of the nineteenth century we are in some danger of forgetting that the men of the thirteenth did not regard all love between man and woman as limited to the material affection to which alone we give the name. This would be to take the heart out of chivalry. We think, too, that Dr. Scartazzini applies too strict a canon to the statements of fact by Dante in such a romantic narrative as the *Vita Nuova*. The poet ought not to be grudged an artistic touch here and there which heightens the interest for us, even though we may deem his statements sometimes exaggerated and at other times untrue; just as we are not bound to believe in the facts of all his visions. Again, the reproaches levelled at the poet by Beatrice in the *Purgatorio* are, according to Dr. Scartazzini himself, based upon his infidelity, not to the real, but to the idealized Beatrice.

Proceeding with the consideration of Dante's inner life, Dr. Scartazzini next calls our attention to the absence of the slightest trace of Christian resignation in all his statements of the terrible grief into which the death of Beatrice plunged him. He finds in this omission proof that there was a time during which the poet abandoned himself to a grief without resignation, faith, or hope. It is possible that shortly after Beatrice's death he contemplated, as Buti tells us, joining the order of St. Francis; but if so he soon gave up the design. episode of his attraction by the donna gentile of the Vita Nuova, §§ 36-40, must have driven it out of his thoughts. The discrepancies between Dante's account in those sections and that in Convito, ii. 2, of his affection for her are pointed out; how in the Vita Nuova it is represented as overcome in a few days, while in the *Convito* it is recorded as finally triumphing. Dr. Scartazzini can find no other way out of this difficulty than by supposing with Fraticelli that Gemma Donati was the donna gentile, and that the later passages in the Vita b

a

p

al

m

ba

13

sta

m

fro

en

du

all

Gu

Bia

ularly litself it was lent of suality al life imself, chival-wife of without ress of

n some did not to the to the This nk, too, e state-the Vita ic touch though and at elieve in levelled ng to Dr. the real,

r life, Dr. e of the ments of nged him. ne during t resigna-Beatrice's e order of ign. The the Vita ghts. The ctions and inted out; e in a few riumphing. difficulty onati was the Vita

Nuova were written during an interval of time in which Dante supposed, wrongly, that he had finally overcome his love for He thinks that Gemma Donati is intended by Dante as the lady whom he identifies in Convito, ii. 2, with the donna gentile of the Vita Nuova; and that the subsequent assertion in Convito, ii. 16, that this lady was Philosophy, is part of an allegorical fiction. We have not space to enter into this discussion; but in passing may call attention to the opposite opinion of Professor D'Ancona (in his already cited 'Discorso su Beatrice,' at p. lxxiii) that Dante, ashamed of the transfer of his affections from the dead Beatrice to the donna gentile of the Vita Nuova, and in order to avoid the consequent reproach of levity, afterwards in the Convito sought to have it supposed that the latter was not an actual person but abstract Philosophy only. Convito, iii. 2, cited by the Professor, seems to us to give his view considerable support. He is inclined to regard the Matilda of the Purgatorio as the real donna gentile.

Dismissing as not proven Boccaccio's imputation upon Dante as having been addicted to *lussuria*, Dr. Scartazzini next discusses what he believes to have been the poet's aberrations from the right way after the death of Beatrice. He concludes that the keen zest with which he then gave himself up to the study of Philosophy, to the total neglect of sacred doctrine, brought him for a time under the influence of religious doubt, and thus estranged him from the idealized Beatrice of the Divina Commedia. This excessive study, begun by the perusal of Boethius and Cicero de Amicitia (Convito, ii. 13) when the poet was somewhat over twenty-five years old (Beatrice died in June 1290), lasted, in Dr. Scartazzini's opinion, till long after the epoch of the Divina Commedia (1300). The Convito was written about 1308. The event which may be taken as marking Dante's escape from the selva oscura was in all probability the death of the Emperor Henry VII. (August 24, 1313). Down to that period Dante had passed through two stages of inner life, (I) that of innocence, lasting from his meeting with Beatrice until her death, and (2) that of deviation from the right way, lasting from that time till 1313. He then entered on the last and third stage, that of a renewal of life, during which he was a true Christian, and, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, an orthodox Catholic.

To complete the story of his inner convictions there remain to be mentioned his changes of political opinion. Born of a Guelph family, he abandoned that party, and, joining the Bianchi, became Ghibelline, about the time of his pursuit of

S

a

C

se

ot

ha

ar

int

arı

tio

reg

giv

as

its

tion

me

the

can

tion

its (

pub Dan

the .

scientific study. And during his exile he severed himself wholly from his Guelph companions, and made of himself a party for himself. Dr. Scartazzini, citing the well-known passages in the Divina Commedia and the De Monarchia, in which Dante himself records these facts, claims for the poet that the first change was the result of honest and sincere conviction, and asserts that the second was no departure from his adopted views, but a protest against the conduct of those who professed them with him.

This brings us to the end of the first or historical part of these Prolegomeni. The second and concluding part is literary. It begins with an interesting survey of the language and literature of Italy in Dante's age, and then treats in detail of

the poet's works seriatim.

We have not space to discuss the interesting review of the progress of the Italian language before Dante's time. Dr. Scartazzini traces it from the fourth to the end of the ninth century, which was the period in which a spoken vernacular gradually evolved itself from the Latin, that remaining the language of written literature and learning. From the tenth century we may date the beginning of attempts to write in the vulgar tongue. Poetry began to be written sooner than prose. The Italian poets at first adopted the language of the Provençal troubadours, but later on began to use their own native dialects.1 To Dante is due the credit of having made the Tuscan dialect the general vernacular of the whole of Italy. In this sense alone can he be said to have created the modern Italian language. Although Guittone d' Arezzo 2 had aspired to the 'dolce stil nuovo' which Guido Guinicelli 3 came nearer to attaining, Dante and his friends, Guido Cavalcanti and Lapo Gianni, were the first to practise it with success.

Dante's first attempts in lyric poetry are to be found in the early part of the Vita Nuova, and show that he was not then free from the trammels of the style of the troubadours. He continued to write sonnets and canzoni all his life, though many of those attributed to him are of questionable authenticity. Generally speaking, they belong to one or other of the cycles of feeling represented by the Vita Nuova on the one hand, and by the Convito on the other. The first cycle is that

We may remember that in the Divina Commedia Virgil speaks Lombard (Inf. xxvii. 20); Dante 'la parola Tosca' (ibid. xxiii. 76); which perhaps is also what is meant by the 'sua favella' of Beatrice (ibid. ii. 57).
² Purg. xxiv. 56.

³ Ibid. xxvi. 92, 97-9.

imself self a nown iia, in e poet e conom his se who

part of is litege and etail of

of the e. Dr. e ninth nacular ing the e tenth write in er than e of the eir own g made vhole of ated the zo 2 had inicelli 3 Cavalit with

found in was not badours. , though e authenner of the the one cle is that

eaks Lom -(6); which trice (ibid.

of profound and tranquil human affection, tinged with the mysticism of the Middle Ages. The second cycle is also concerned with love, so called; but the love has become irritable, and often dissatisfied with the Philosophy which is supposed to be the beloved object, but proves herself an exacting and

unsatisfactory mistress.

We must touch very briefly on Dr. Scartazzini's analyses of the poet's different works other than the Divina Commedia. A few remarks will suffice to call attention to such of his conclusions as are important. With regard to the Vita Nuova, which he thinks was written somewhere between 1292 and 1295, he points out that the lyrical portions were composed before the prose commentary, at different times and occasions, beginning with the poet's second meeting with Beatrice. The prose was added after her death. All the sonnets relating to the period covered by the book are not included in it. There can be no doubt that the visions recorded are not to be regarded as having actually happened. We may also believe that Dante retouched and improved the sonnets and canzoni before publishing them. The whole is a work of art, a true but idealized history. As to the Convito (which Dr. Scartazzini writes Convivio), the poet's object in composing it seems to have been twofold: (1) to clear himself of the imputation of lussuria; (2) to give instruction to others in his own studies. The bulk to which the work would have attained, if carried out as intended, is then noticed. There were to have been fourteen annotated canzoni. Proofs are adduced from the book as we have it that the whole intended contents had been carefully thought out and arranged beforehand. Notwithstanding its immense erudition—the greater part, however, now obsolete—it is not to be regretted that Dante left it unfinished. The reason for this given by Boccaccio-viz., a change of purpose-is accepted as the true one. Dr. Scartazzini assigns 1308 as the date of its composition, and thinks that Dante abandoned its completion because of the changed disposition which, as before mentioned, came upon him in 1313. Where it was written there is nothing to show. The De Vulgari Eloquentia cannot have been written before 1309. Its sudden termination in the middle of a chapter has never been accounted for.

The predominant characteristic of the Middle Age being its dualism, which made itself felt in all the relations of life, public and private, civil and religious, moral and literary, Dante opposed to it everywhere the conception of unity. In the Divina Commedia he opposes the dualism between morals

and religion; in the *Convito* the social dualism which made a great gulf between the learned classes and the people; in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, the dualism between literature and language; and in the *De Monarchia* the dualism between the secular and the spiritual powers, the Empire and the Papacy. The gist of his examination in that work of the relations proper between the State and the Church lies in the demonstrations of the third book that the Emperor derived his authority immediately from God and not from the Roman pontiff. Dr. Scartazzini marshals the arguments *pro* and *con*. on the question whether this treatise was written before or after Dante's exile, and whether or not before the *Convito*, and professes himself unable to decide between them.

Lamenting that not even a scrap of Dante's handwriting has been preserved to us, Dr. Scartazzini passes in review the eleven remaining of his letters which have any pretence to His opinion is that: (1) The letter to the Cardinal of Prato has no historical evidence either in support or in disproof of it. (2) That to Oberto and Guido, Counts of Romena, is apocryphal. (3) That to the Marquis Moroello Malaspina may be genuine, and, if so, relates to an unexpected surprise given to the poet by his wife Gemma, in paying him a sudden visit in the Casentino; and is of great interest as throwing light on Dante's domestic relations with his wife. (4) The letter to Cino da Pistoia is apocryphal. (5) The letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy has never been doubted, and Dr. Scartazzini will only say that he is not convinced that it is authentic. (All the foregoing letters are without any date.) (6) The letter to the Florentines, dated March 31, 1311, bears internal evidence of authenticity. (7) The letter to the Emperor, Henry VII., dated April 16, 1311, is undoubtedly authentic. (8) The alleged letter of March 30, 1314, written from Venice by Dante to Guido da Polenta, when on an assumed embassy there from him, is a foolish imposture. (9) The letter written during the vacancy of the Papal chair (1314-1316) to the Italian Cardinals is probably authentic. (10) The letter to a Florentine friend, refusing to return to Florence, is almost certainly spurious. (11) A long examination devoted to the celebrated letter to Can Grande della Scala, satisfies Dr. Scartazzini that, although written in the spirit of Dante, it was not composed by him.

The two Latin eclogues purporting to be written by Dante to Giovanni del Virgilio, in answer to those addressed to him ic

n

m

po

So

WI

ye

do

ye

pre

hir

thi

In

wa

made ble; in erature etween nd the lies in mperor of from numents written fore the

between dwriting view the tence to r to the in supd Guido, Marquis tes to an Gemma, and is of stic rela-Pistoia is eoples of will only 1 the foreter to the vidence of enry VII., (8) The Venice by d embassy

n by Dante ssed to him

ter written

16) to the

e letter to , is almost

oted to the

atisfies Dr.

f Dante, it

by the latter, urging him to write the *Divina Commedia* in Latin, both seem to Dr. Scartazzini to be authentic, but with characteristic caution he will not pledge himself to the fact.

An examination of a few apocryphal writings attributed to Dante concludes what our author has to say of his minor works, and brings him to the consideration of the *Divina Commedia*. Upon this he gives us a most valuable and exhaustive criticism, to appreciate which the reader must peruse the whole of it. We can here only refer to a few

salient points.

The first germ of the great poem is to be found in the Canzone Donne ch' avete intelletto d' amore in the Vita Nuova, § 19, where Dante says of himself that he dirà nell' inferno a' malnati: Io vidi la speranza de' beati. These words indicate that the poet had already at that time conceived the idea of a work which should take the form of a journey through the realms of eternity, or, at all events, through Hell. The object of this work would have been the glorification of Beatrice. And after her death, when writing the concluding section (43) of the Vita Nuova, he still had in view, as the object of the studies which he was about to undertake, the qualifying himself to say of her what had never been said of any woman. Those studies afterwards gave an enlarged scope to his intention, though even while he was engaged upon the Convito and the De Vulgari Eloquentia he does not seem to have as yet conceived the idea of a poem which, like the Divina Commedia, embraces the whole of knowledge, the whole life of an age; not one, but two worlds; not time alone but also eternity: which, the mighty epic of Redemption, points out to sinful man the way of salvation, and is the song, not of a single poet, but of universal humanity. This gigantic conception was the fruit of long years of study, and we believe that Dr. Scartazzini is right in supposing that the poem was not written until after the death of the Emperor Henry VII.: i.e., that it was composed between 1313 and 1321, the last years of the poet. The date assumed for the vision is no doubt 1300, but that was probably selected as being the year of the great Jubilee, and because of the strong impression thereby produced on Dante, which probably gave him the first impulse towards an amendment of life, though this did not take final effect until thirteen years later. From Inferno xix. we can gather as a certainty that that canto was not written till after the death of Clement V. in 1314, and we know that the *Paradiso* was only completed during the last months of Dante's life.

Another opinion in which we thoroughly concur is that the materials for the poem were accumulated through a long previous course of years. Before beginning to write the first canto, Dante had decided that there should be in all a hundred, had settled what should be contained in each of those cantos, and had made an accurate and detailed sketch of the whole work. He had also collected the immense mass. of materials which was to fill out the sketch. Probably hundreds of terzine had been composed in advance, and were ready to be fitted into their proper places after undergoing a final polish. As the work of composition progressed, some of these may have been rejected and others adopted, but the mass was ready to hand when final composition began. many topographical photographs inserted had been taken from time to time as occasion served upon the different spots. Boccaccio's story of the recovery of the first seven cantos of the Inferno after the poet's exile, though literally untrue, may have the foundation in fact that there was a discovery which brought to light some materials prepared for use in the work. And his other story of the dream of the poet's son Jacopo, by means of which the thirteen last cantos of the Paradiso were recovered after his father's death, is useful as a corroboration of the assertion that the poem was only finished during Dante's closing days and did not see the light till he was dead.

As to his materials, he found them in the book of nature and the heart of man, his history and vicissitudes, his character and habits, joys and griefs, virtues and vices, sympathies and antipathies, life and death. He availed himself of all the learning of his time, the sacred Scriptures, holy Fathers, scholastic and mystic authors, taking from the latter much of the symbolism which is rife in the poem; the Greek and Latin philosophers, the classic poets of antiquity, Virgil in particular. In theology he is the faithful disciple of Peter Lombard, Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas Aquinas. Aristotle is his chief master in philosophy, but he also has recourse to the Arabian commentators on the master, and to Plato. external form of the poem is greatly taken from the literature of the middle ages, the legends and visions relating to the other world, in which it abounded. The subject was ready

to the poet's hand.

The key to the marvellous arithmetical symmetry of the structure of the *Divina Commedia* is to be found in the mystic importance which, as we know from the *Vita Nuova*,

XUM

he

H

pu

pu

ha

the

In

thr

disc

con

thir

§ 30, Dante attached to the numbers 10, 3, and 9; 10 being in his eyes the perfect number. The whole poem is a combination of these numbers. It contains three cantiche and is written in terza rima. Treating the first canto of the Inferno as a general introduction, each cantica consists of thirtythree cantos, i.e. three multiplied by ten and added to the product. The hundred cantos of the whole poem are the product of ten multiplied by ten. Each of the three realms is divided into nine regions, i.e. three multiplied by itself. But ten also has its share in them. To the nine circles of the Inferno a vestibule is added; in Purgatory the Antipurgatorio consists of three ledges, which, added to the seven circles of Purgatory itself, make ten; and to the nine heavens of Paradise is added that of the Empyrean. Three beasts oppose Dante's ascent of the delectable hill; three blest ladies care for him in the court of Heaven; he has three guides, Virgil, Beatrice, and St. Bernard. Lucifer has three faces; there are three sparks inflaming the hearts of the Florentines; the Furies are three, &c. Such coincidences as Carducci has pointed out further, e.g. Beatrice's first appearance to Dante in the thirtieth canto of the Purgatorio and her final departure from him in the thirtieth canto of the Paradiso, may be accidental, as may be the fact that the Inferno contains thirtyfive verses less than the Purgatorio and thirty-eight less than the Paradiso; but even this may have a recondite reason unknown to us.

Passing over Dr. Scartazzini's abstract of the structural conformation of Dante's three worlds, we may notice his clear explanation of the reason why such sins as sloth, envy, and pride are not punished at all in the *Inferno*; nor such as heresy, violence, fraud, and treachery, at all in the *Purgatorio*. He justly remarks that whereas committed sin alone is punished in the *Inferno*, and that by way of expiation; in the *Purgatorio* evil thoughts also, being the root of sin, are chastened; the prevailing object of punishment there being purification and correction. Sloth, envy, and pride, being habits of mind which *prompt*, only, to sin, therefore find a place there for repentance, whereas the sins *committed* under their influence are precisely those which are avenged in the *Inferno* alone.

The events of the poet's momentous journey through the three realms are then summarized, and there follows a full discussion of the meaning of the opening allegory of the poem, contained in the two initial cantos of the *Inferno*. In this we think we can detect some slight confusion of thought. Dr. Scar-

obably d were going a i, some but the taken t spots. Into sof ue, may y which he work.

were re-

ration of

Dante's

uring

that

a long

e first

all a

ach of

sketch

e mass

d.

of nature
character
thies and
f all the
Fathers,
much of
and Latin
barticular.
Lombard,
tle is his
se to the
ato. The

etry of the and in the lita Nuova,

literature

ng to the

was ready

m

SC

tr

th

of

SO

un

Pa

its

ac

fut

acc

hea

be

to

Th

he

zin

SO 1

in i

pre

tem

But

ope

sho

da

for

for

hear

tion

Pur

whe

the

lowe

On

and V

tazzini insists strongly on the adoption of the Scriptural sense of the expressions of the poet. Tried by this test he regards the sleep into which Dante fell, when abandoning the true way, as the symbol of a sinful life (p. 471); but on p. 472 we are told that the selva oscura symbolizes it. Again, at p. 472, he rejects the interpretation which sees in the three beasts the emblems of pride, envy, and avarice, or of sensuality, pride, and avarice, as inadmissible, because the beasts appear outside of the selva oscura; whereas, if they represented three of the deadly sins they would be found inside the wood—i.e. would be part and parcel of the sinful life. But at p. 473 he says that the lion does symbolize pride. His theory is that the true way abandoned by the poet is divine revelation; the sun which gilds the top of the delectable hill is God. The panther

is unbelief; the lion, pride; the wolf, false doctrine.

The allegory has a personal application to Dante, but also a universal reference to man in general. Dante, the individual, exchanged his life of innocence for one of sin somewhat before the year 1295. Arrived at the age of thirtyfive in 1300, the year of Jubilee, he felt promptings of repentance, but sought for peace by a wrong road, that of the wolf of false doctrine, in which he found himself thwarted by the panther of unbelief and the lion of philosophic pride. These prevented him from ascending the hill of peace and virtue. Divine Grace at last came to his aid and led him by the route of Hell and Purgatory up to Paradise. The fortunes of the individual Dante are so prominent throughout the poem that it is often difficult to distinguish the points in which he represents the universal man. But this second branch of the allegory is founded on the truth that every man has his period of innocence—his Vita Nuova. From this he falls into the fearful, thick, and obscure wood of sin, passion, and vice; though he knows not how and when he enters it. But he awakes at last and endeavours at first to win restoration by his own strength. The three beasts—symbolical as above —prevent him, until Divine Grace salutes him with the words A te convien tenere altro viaggio, and sets him on the way of salvation through contrition, confession, and satisfaction.

Dr. Scartazzini will not affirm that the Divina Commedia had not a political as well as a moral and religious element. The famous prophecy of the Veltro seems to indicate as And, he asks, from whom did the poet hope for the total eradication and destruction of false doctrine? are riddles in the Divina Commedia which still await their

Œdipus.

July

se of

s the

y, as

told

, he

the

ride.

tside

the

ould

says

t the

sun

ather

, but

, the

f sin

nirty-

pent-

wolf

v the

These

rirtue.

y the

nes of

poem

ch he

of the

falls

n, and

ration

above

words

vay of

media

ement.

ate as

for the

There

t their

n.

But

But we must be brief. Dr. Scartazzini's moral reflections on the appropriateness of the punishments in the Inferno and the Purgatorio to the sins punished are not new. We content ourselves by recording his observation that the Inferno is meant by the poet as a revelation of the actual eternal doom of hardened sinners, as well as a symbol of the state of the souls of such men during this life. He also reminds us of Dante's affirmation (in De Monarchia, iii. 15) that the terrestrial Paradise at the top of the Mount of Purgatory figures the happiness of this life; the celestial Paradise the beatitude of Life Eternal. And he well points out that, as Dante's is a Christian not Mahommedan Paradise, and, as the bliss of the soul does not consist in the gratification of the senses but in union with God, there was no room in his plan for filling Paradise with a variety of delights. The only gradation in its bliss lies in the increase of the knowledge of God which is acquired by the Saints; and it may be reserved for some future commentator to trace this increase through Dante's accounts of those with whom he meets in the different heavens.

In selecting the inmates of his three realms Dante may be supposed to have been actuated by the resolution to leave to posterity a picture of the men and manners of his own age. This he did with fearless impartiality. To the objection that he put so few of his contemporaries in Paradise, Dr. Scartazzini answers that the necessity for the introduction there of so many learned Saints and doctors capable of aiding Beatrice in increasing the poet's knowledge and solving his difficulties, precluded him from giving up space to interviews with contemporaries who would have been incompetent for that task. But that it must be admitted that caprice seems to have operated in the relegation to the Inferno of many whom we should not have expected to find there-notably Francesca da Rimini and Brunetto Latini. Strange also is it that but for the Divina Commedia the odious stigma which it affixes for ever to poor Ser Brunetto would have been wholly unheard of.

Dr. Scartazzini next devotes a section to the consideration of the functions of the guardians of the Inferno and of Purgatory. He holds that the duty of those in the Inferno, whether mythological personages or demons, is to prevent, not the escape of the doomed sinners, but their descent to any lower depth than that assigned them for their eternal abode. On the other hand, the angel warders of Purgatory encourage and invite the souls to mount higher. He does not think that

VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

. .

Matilda was meant to be the guardian of the terrestrial Paradise. Virgil's language at the end of *Purg.* xxvii. imports that the soul which had passed through all the seven circles of Purgatory had no further need of any guardian. For this

reason there are no guardians in Paradise.

Cato of Utica's post as guardian of the foot of the Mount of Purgatory commends itself to Dr. Scartazzini. Dante's admiration for him forbade his being placed in the Inferno with the suicides, but could not allow him access to Purgatory itself. He therefore placed him, not upon, but at the foot of, the Purgatorial Mount, condemning him to pass his whole time there until the Day of Judgment, while he saw all other souls than himself admitted to undergo a speedier purgation.

Our author concludes his review of the Divina Commedia by an explanation of the allegorical meaning which he attaches to Virgil and Beatrice, Dante's two and only guides. throughout. (In passing we here again notice a discrepancy, Dr. Scartazzini having before mentioned St. Bernard as a third guide.) Quoting Dante's well-known statement in De Monarchia, iii. 15, that man requires two guides in life, one, the Emperor, to direct him to happiness in this life, the other, the Supreme Pontiff, to lead him to life eternal, he regards Virgil as symbolical of the Imperial, Beatrice of the Ecclesiastical, authority. This, as he says, amounts to the same thing as saying that Virgil represents natural reason, or Philosophy; Beatrice divine science, or Theology. It is easy to see why Virgil was selected as the type of Imperial authority: he being not only the poet of the Roman Empire, but the favourite author of the Middle Ages and of the poet himself. And love prompted Dante to make his Beatrice the glorified being who conducts him to heavenly bliss as she had led him in the right way while she was on earth. He has idealized Virgil not less than her, but subordinates him If Virgil guides Dante it is by the command and under the influence of Beatrice. We may enforce this last observation by reference to the remarkable lines in which Dante, looking up to Beatrice as she sits enthroned in bliss, makes his final address to her (Par. xxxi, 79-90). In these he attributes to her power and goodness the grace and virtue which he has derived from all that he has seen and heard. She it is who has drawn him from slavery (to sin) into freedom. And to her he addresses the prayer that, as she had restored health to his soul, so she will grant that it may, on quitting the body, be found acceptable in her sight. all but apotheosis of her who had so guided his whole life

t

tı

th

01

iu

restrial imports circles For this

Mount Dante's Inferno irgatory foot of, s whole all other irgation. mmedia hich he y guides repancy, ard as a nt in De life, one, he other, regards e Ecclehe same eason, or It is easy al authopire, but the poet Beatrice iss as she rth. He nates him nand and this last in which d in bliss, In these

and virtue

nd heard.

into free-

s she had

t may, on

whole life

ht.

This

seems to point to some higher conception of her by the poet, good Catholic as he was, than that of an embodiment of Ecclesiastical authority. What, however, his full conception was, who shall say? But that the personal element formed part of it we are convinced. No mere abstract principle or virtue sits in heaven at the feet of Mary and at the side of Rachel; but that incarnation of all beauty and purity so touchingly described in the *Vita Nuova*, § 34:—

Il piacere della sua beltade Partendo sè dalla nostra veduta, Divenne spirital bellezza grande, Che per lo cielo spande Luce d' amor che gli angeli saluta, E lo intelletto loro alto e sottile Face maravigliar; tanto è gentile! 1

We have no room left for following Dr. Scartazzini through his observations on the codici, the editions, the commentaries, the foreign translators and expounders, the illustrators, imitators, and admirers of the Divine Poem. It must suffice to say that he recognizes the value of the labours of Dr. Moore in seeking to establish a genealogy of authentic codici; labours in which Professor Täuber, of Winterthur, has also been independently engaged, with the result that these two students of Dante have arrived at practically the same conclusions. Dr. Scartazzini claims the merit of having first suggested this study, seven years ago. Among English translators he apparently prefers Longfellow, but chiefly on the ground of the numerous editions through which his translation has passed. Nothing succeeds like success. We notice with satisfaction, however, as we have long held the same opinion, that Cary's version is deemed undeserving of the success which it achieved. We are also glad that the transcendent superiority of Scaramuzza's illustrations of the Divina Commedia to all others is fully recognized.

In conclusion we must point out that the world of Dante students is deeply indebted to Dr. Scartazzini for the very judicious selection of works bearing upon his subject which

1 Which may be thus translated :-

The form of her enchanting loveliness, As soon as it departed from our sight, Became in spiritual beauty grand, Which makes through heaven expand A love that cheers the angels with its light, And leads their high and subtle intellect To marvel at her in such graces decked.

he gives in the Bibliographical Appendices to his various sections. As he tells us in his preface, his choice of them is the result of personal study. He has inserted none which he deemed unworthy of a place in his book, and he carefully discriminates between the merits of those which are inserted.

ART. V.-CHRIST OR PLATO?

The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. The Hibbert Lectures, 1888. By the late EDWIN HATCH, D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. Edited by A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (London, 1890.)

To trace the influence of one historic force upon another is a task which requires dexterity and skill. The remains which survive of the history of the past are never separated scientifically into classes when they come before us. The various influences which have gone to make them are buried in them in the profoundest confusion. Some of the factors which really operated in producing the result have vanished altogether, and it would be as hopeless a task to disinter them and estimate their contribution as to trace in a full-grown tree the effects of a summer shower a hundred years ago. Others are more readily appreciable, and of these it is possible in some degree to calculate the effects; but even here there is room for much misapprehension, because our knowledge is always partial—always falls short of the reality, always tends to present as simple what was complex and to beguile us into accepting results which square with the facts we have happened to examine. If, then, we set out to consider the influence of one order of ideas and usages upon another, we must bear in mind that we are mostly dealing with forces both of which are only partially known in themselves. We have the result, in which the two are commingled, but we do not know, as a rule, exactly what either would have done by itself. All we can do is to be certain that the picture we give of either is as complete as we can make it.

These commonplace truths are peculiarly necessary to be kept in view in dealing with the subject which the late Dr. tl

B

re

various nem is which c carech are

July

he late History FAIR-Oxford.

other is remains er sepaefore us. nem are e of the ult have task to trace in hundred , and of effects; sion, beshort of vas comh square then, we deas and t we are partially the two ctly what is to be

sary to be e late Dr.

nplete as

Hatch chose for his Hibbert Lectures. The learned author in the first chapter lays down the outlines of the method he proposes to follow. While there are many wholesome truths proclaimed in this lecture there is an omission to be noticed which strikes the eye at once, and might, we think, have been avoided if the commonplaces set down above had been borne in mind. There is no attempt whatever to define precisely what Christianity was, or at least the short description given of it seems to omit some of the most essential features. The book opens with the remark that 'it is impossible for anyone, whether he be a student of history or no, to fail to notice a difference of both form and content between the Sermon on the Mount and the Nicene Creed.' Then later on, in the same page, we read, 'If anyone thinks that (this contrast) is sufficiently explained by saying that the one is a sermon and the other a creed, it must be pointed out in reply that the question why an ethical sermon stood in the forefront of the teaching of Jesus Christ, and a metaphysical creed in the forefront of the Christianity of the fourth century, is a problem which claims investigation.' From this language one would be disposed to infer that the author regarded the Sermon on the Mount as giving a complete account of the Christianity of Christ. At the end of the last lecture (p. 351) this anticipation is in some degree confirmed. 'It is possible,' writes Dr. Hatch, 'to urge that what was absent from the early form cannot be essential. and that the Sermon on the Mount is not an outlying part of the Gospel, but its sum.' Strictly speaking, the office of a critic may be said to cease with the statement of this principle; for it means that, however excellent the exposition in the course of the lectures of Greek thought and usage, the results must be wrong, seeing that the view adopted of Christianity is so entirely inadequate. According to it Christianity will have had little or nothing to contribute to the whole process; its essential features have simply been swamped under a mass of alien material. It has been merely passive and plastic, taking, after a struggle no doubt, the form imposed upon it from without, and utterly transmuted in the process. Such a point of view as this would require, as we think, no criticism; the mere statement of it should be enough. But it would be doing an injustice to the memory and high reputation of Dr. Hatch, and to those who have so laboriously brought his work before the world, to treat it in so supercilious a manner; we propose, therefore, to lay before our readers some few reasons for thinking that Christianity was

a more complex thing than it has seemed to Dr. Hatch, to indicate some points which illustrate the true relation of Hellenism to Christianity as we conceive it, and to comment briefly on the theory of history which seems to underlie Dr. Hatch's book.

Before we enter upon this task it will be well to sketch briefly the outline of the lectures. Their matter falls under five heads. After an introductory statement of method the second lecture proceeds to deal with the subject of Greek education, and is intended to put before us as clearly as possible the influences which moulded the Greek mind in the early centuries after Christ. This subject is treated with the wide learning and literary finish which are characteristic of the author. We have not space to discuss it, but we can cordially commend it to our readers. The next lecture deals with Greek and Christian exegesis. Under this head we have an interesting account of the way in which the literal sense of written words gradually became subordinate to the inferred or allegorical sense. The treatment of the Homeric stories by late philosophers, it is argued, became the type of the Christian exegetical methods. We then come to the province of rhetoric. Here, again, ample learning is brought to bear upon the question in hand. The rise and growth of the peculiar forms of rhetoric which obtained in the philosophical schools of Greece are admirably shown. It is then argued that Christianity adopted the Greek method of set discourses and homilies, and by this means stifled the purer form of preaching which had been prevalent in the Church, and of which the latest appearance was in the Montanist prophesyings. We turn, fourthly, to Greek philosophy. subject, as may well be supposed, occupies a very large portion of the book. Dr. Hatch points out the inveterate tendency of the Greek mind to dialectical discussions, the changes in meaning of the word δόγμα, and its gradual association with the ideas of fixity and definiteness; the importance given, as philosophy decayed and original thinking became less common, to the stated convictions or dogmas of the leading philosophic teachers. He shows how deep was the conviction in the Greek mind that an orderly system of ideas must correspond with the course of nature. It was, then, this 'tendency to speculate,' which was absorbed into Christianity, rather than the 'speculations themselves'-the belief in the value and validity of reasoned expositions of the faith, so strongly contrasted with the simpler and predominantly ethical acceptance of it-which was characteristic of the

Hatch, ation of omment erlie Dr.

July

sketch ls under hod the f Greek as posin the ed with cteristic we can re deals we have ral sense inferred c stories e of the province to bear n of the osophical argued iscourses form of n, and of nist proy. This e portion tendency anges in tion with ce given, ame less e leading e conviceas must this 'tenristianity, ef in the faith, so minantly

c of the

earlier years of the Church's life. The subject is worked out in detail under the heads of 'Ethics' and 'Theology.' In each case the result was the same: in each case Greek thought triumphed. In ethics Greek influences produced the practice of asceticism and the juristic conception of individual rights, which, Dr. Hatch maintains, is in flat opposition to the Sermon on the Mount. In the province of metaphysical theology Greek influence resulted in a remote and transcendent view of God, ascribed to the influence of Plato (p. 208), together with a belief in the value of dogmatic definitions. Dr. Hatch admits that the Christian world has not received without modification the predominantly Greek conception of God as a moral governor, which Origen put forth in his Principia, but he insists that the conception of probation is Greek and not Hebrew (cf. pp. 231-2). Lastly, we are taken into the shrines where the Greek mysteries were celebrated, and there we find the source of much of the ritual and many of the ideas connected with the Christian sacraments. The work concludes with two lectures on the 'Incorporation of Christian Ideas into a Body of Doctrine' and the 'Transformation of the Basis of Christian Union.' These sum up what has gone before and place the general doctrine in clear light. We need not pause upon them here. From this brief outline it will be seen that the utterances above cited concerning the Sermon on the Mount are by no means accidental. They represent Dr. Hatch's real conviction, and are not to be explained as the adoption of a popular and unscientific form of expression. The 'sum' of all that Christ came to do was apparently exhausted in His first sermon; for everything else-exegesis, doctrine, ethics, organization, and ritual—we are indebted to the mind of Greece.

Is it true that there are no vestiges of any of these things to be found in the New Testament? And must we suppose, granted that any such traces exist, that we already have begun to feel the influence of Hellenism? Let us call to mind what exactly the New Testament is. It is a collection of books written under various circumstances, and as a rule under the pressure of a temporary need. In some cases both the occasion and the date are hard to determine; in others they are clear and indisputable. These books, then, thus written, are gradually collected together into one body. And this is not done casually or without investigation; the process turns on the inner character of the books themselves. Their inner character is the force which transforms them from a collection of accidental and ephemeral effusions into a literature

of sacred books. We do not, then, expect in them any formal statements of doctrine or rules for usage, except in so far as these were rendered necessary by the peculiar circumstances out of which they grew. It may, perhaps, be maintained with truth that there is practically no theology characteristically Christian if the Sermon on the Mount be taken as the sum of the Christian faith. Yet even here there is a markedly higher conception of God offered to the world than that which Dr. Hatch ascribes to the Jewish and early Christian mind.

'In primitive Christianity we find ourselves in another sphere of ideas (than that of Greece); we seem to be breathing the air of Syria, with Syrian forms moving round us and speaking a language which is not familiar to us. For the Greek city, with its orderly government, we have to substitute the picture of an Eastern sheyk, at once the paymaster of his dependents and their judge. Two conceptions are dominant—that of wages for work done and that of positive law' (p. 224). At the same time 'Christianity had no need to borrow from Greek philosophy either the idea of the unity of God or the belief that He made the world' (p. 188).

It was only on the moral side that the idea of the 'Eastern sheyk' was dominant. There are a number of passages in the Sermon on the Mount which emphasize the notion of reward, and, if they stood alone, might seem to suggest no higher idea than they do to Dr. Hatch. There are two others not cited in the lectures which throw some considerable light on the sense in which 'reward' is meant. 'I say unto you, Love your enemies . . . that ye may be the children (viol) of your Father which is in heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good' (chap. v. 44, 45); and again, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect' (v. 48). Both these passages place before the hearers of the Sermon as their true ideal a growing assimilation of themselves to their Father in heaven; and this is not precisely the same thing as the attainment of wages at the hands of a paymaster or the gratification of a severe and vindictive judge (cf. p. 225). We do not think, then, that even within the very restricted area which is allowed to primitive Christianity Dr. Hatch has been quite just to it. But the Sermon on the Mount, we are ready to admit, is not a dogmatic utterance; it is primarily ethical, and, we may add, more closely bound up with the law than seems to be popularly acknowledged. It promulgates a moral code far higher than anything in the old law, but it never passes beyond the legal point of view. The Mosaic law

y formal so far as nstances intained aracterisen as the narkedly han that Christian

sphere of r of Syria, age which y govern-k, at once nceptions f positive need to of God or

'Eastern ssages in notion of ggest no are two consider-'I say children keth His 44, 45); r Father passages rue ideal ather in g as the er or the 225). We cted area has been are ready y ethical, law than ulgates a w, but it

osaic law

dealt in warnings and threats of vengeance, the law of Christ in blessings and promises of reward. But there is no talk in the Sermon of that which the law could not do, because it was weak through the flesh; there is no modification in the externality of the law. The commands as interpreted reach in to the heart and touch desires and impulses unexpressed as yet in act. But they are still compelling the will from outside; man has still in his own strength, so far as he learns from the Sermon, to carry out every jot and tittle of the Father's will. Surely it is no relief to the legal position of things that we have to keep an infinitely harder law. Though it be promulgated in quiet accents, and without the terrors of Sinai, it lays bare the helpless opposition of the human heart only the more searchingly; it 'kills' only the more relentlessly as it reveals the desperate breach between the

soul of man and God.

And there is no intelligible connexion between the Sermon, simply as it stands, uninterpreted by the later life and sayings of our Lord, and the strongly dogmatic utterances of St. Paul. Dr. Hatch admits that there were 'elements' in the simple Jewish faith 'in which the teaching of St. Paul had already given a foothold for speculation' (p. 238). seems hardly an adequate presentment of the facts of the case. However true it may be that St. Paul was educated in Greek letters, there can be no question that his mind moved on Jewish lines, and was ingrained through and through with Jewish associations. And yet in the writings of St. Paul, even within the limits of the four undisputed letters, we find germs of many of the later developments in doctrine, ethics, and even in a measure in organization. Let us take a few only out of the many points which might be illustrated. First, the nature of Christ, Divine and human. On this head, without going outside the circle of the four Epistles which are undisputed, it is possible to obtain a certain decision. He is the image of God (2 Cor. iv. 4); He is God's own Son (Rom. viii. 3, Gal. iv. 44); He is marked out as Son of God in power by the resurrection of the dead (Rom. i. 4). Even if we do not claim Rom. ix. 5 as a direct ascription of Divinity to Christ, His place in connexion with God the Father in thanksgivings and benedictions proves the same point. No doubt there is no mention here of the word ομοούσιος, or any other term by which the Church has thought fit to preserve its belief in His Godhead; but the fact that He is coupled with God the Father on such occasions implies that He is placed on a level with the Father. Cf. especially

μόνω σοφώ Θεώ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δόξα (Rom. xvi. 27). No less certainly is He Man. He is born of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3; cf. ix. 5); born of a woman (Gal. iv. 4). But yet He knows not sin (2 Cor. v. 21) this humanity He suffers and dies (Rom. v. 18), and His death is the means of salvation to men (cf. Gal. i. 3). These are not indefinite or accidental utterances; and they are necessary to the whole fabric of the Epistles. Is it not, then, a strange thing to regard the doctrines of the Church as remaining vague and indefinite until stereotyped under Greek influence? Surely St. Paul's words, of which we have cited but a few, imply one theory as to the nature of our Lord and exclude the opposite, and the Nicene definitions do no more. And, again, these words of St. Paul have much more in common with the later dogmatic definitions than with the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, were this Sermon all the content of Christianity it is difficult to see how any of the Pauline Epistles can, on scientific historical grounds, be allowed to date from the first age. There must have been something very remarkable about the progress of Christianity if it began with the Sermon on the Mount, was then subjected to the Pauline influence, then passed through a period in which any theory of the nature of its Founder was tenable, until the force of 'majorities at meetings' determined its thought in certain moulds. Dr. Hatch admits that there are signs in St. Jude and elsewhere of definitely authoritative teaching (p. 314, n. 1); can we suppose that this was formulated apart from the Apostolic writings?

Further, if we turn to the questions of ethics and organization we find these closely bound up with these dogmatic convictions. If it is a question of purity, St. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to that virtue because they are bought with a price, because they are to be raised again as God raised Christ, because their bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost. If it is a question of sinning, in the freedom of the new covenant from the law, he warns the Romans that they live with the life of Christ, and cannot therefore sin any more: they shared His death, burial, and resurrection when they were baptized; the life they live now should rightly be the risen life of Christ. Or, again, if it is a question of the freedom of prophesyings the Corinthians are exhorted to peace and order on the ground that God is not a God of disorder, but of peace; and, once more, the separateness of functions among the Roman Christians is based on the harmony and order in the Body of Christ. There seems to

No David woman (1: In nd His These hev are it not. Church d under we have of our cions do e much ns than Sermon any of nds, be re been stianity bjected n which ntil the ught in igns in eaching

organgmatic exhorts ht with raised Holy of the as that ore sin rection should a quesare exis not a ateness on the ems to

d apart

be in the mind of St. Paul no such isolation between the separate spheres of doctrine, ethics, and organization as Dr. Hatch desires. A doctrine, to St. Paul, translates itself readily into a moral command for the individual or for the Church. He is not conscious of being fettered by doctrines, however definite, provided only they are true. Thought, moral and social life, are all to be brought under the sway of Christ's Gospel, and this will give rise in the several cases to doctrine, ethics, organization. We cannot but feel that the recognition of this point is important in its bearing on critical questions. The Pauline Epistles are relatively much further advanced in the direction of later Church doctrines and usages than the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, a work upon which Dr. Hatch lays much emphasis. In this document there are but few signs of any complex or developing Church-life. are regulations for dealing with prophets, and especially with those who falsely claim a prophet's rights; and, in the passage in chap. i. generally regarded as an interpolation, there are regulations referring to the existence of persons claiming Christian support without proper reason. In the Church from which this document emerged the most important problems requiring to be dealt with were, apparently, such as occupy the Charity Organization Society now. The readiness of Christians to help their brethren in need had produced a crop of false claimants. The method adopted of dealing with the questions is simply to develope the existing precepts. The rule to give of our goods to those in need is so interpreted as to exclude fraudulent claims. This was not in the letter of the law, but was added when occasion required. In the Corinthian Church far more serious problems had arisen. The Resurrection was denied; it had become a question whether celibacy was not necessary to the true Christian; and St. Paul deals with these points partly by referring to the tradition of the Church (1 Cor. xv. 3-8), partly by developing and expanding principles left by our Lord (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, and 25). The same would be true of the Epistle to the Galatians. There is in these epistles a greater advance in definiteness in proportion as the questions raised are trying and important. Is it not more likely that the *Teaching* represents the life of an out-of-the-way Church, which even in its remoteness attempts to deal with the problems which arise, than the normal type of primitive Christianity posterior in time to the four undisputed letters of St. Paul? In the preface to the last edition of Dr. Liddon's Bampton Lectures-dated, it is interesting to remember, but two or three days before the author was seized with his fatal illness—in this preface a contrast is drawn between the older and more modern Unitarianism, between Channing and Dr. Martineau. It is pointed out that whereas the older writers accepted the Gospels but denied the Church's interpretation, the modern school accepts the interpretation, but denies the authenticity of the works. Thus Dr. Martineau asserts that the author of the Fourth Gospel believed in the Incarnation of the Son of God, but denies that he was St. John. Surely it would be simpler to adopt some such method here—to place the Pauline Epistles later in time than documents which are so much less advanced than they are in standpoint, and not to ask credence for so paradoxical a view of things as is implied by Dr. Hatch. One of the most learned supporters of the view despairs of it; Dr. Harnack tells us (Dogmengeschichte, Bd. i. p. 93, ed. 1)—

'The conviction that the Pauline theology is not identical with the original Gospel, and still less with any later doctrine of faith, requires so much historical judgment, and so much resolute intention not to allow oneself to be deceived in the enquiry by the canon of the New Testament, that we cannot look forward to a change in the dominant point of view for a considerable time.'

Our contention has been all along that the hypotheses that the Teaching of the Apostles represents primitive Christianity, and that the Gnostics were the first Christian theologians, are completely unnecessary, if a reasonable portion of the New Testament be accepted as genuine; and now it turns out that we have been deceived by the New Testament canon. But it seems that a good many are in the same case and are likely to remain so; perhaps, therefore, we need be in no great hurry to change our view; we may wonder instead whether the paradox of Harnack will survive long enough to be generally accepted. We started upon the investigation of this point by recalling the nature of the New Testament. As it stands, perhaps, it will be admitted to present a more or less coherent view of things; and, indeed, this fact is made to tell against it by those who wish to derive Catholicism from some less authoritative source. We may, then, surely raise the question whether it is likely that such a collection of books would have been made except in the interest of a spirit to which they appealed. Their inner character, the unity which underlies their difference, shows that they were collected, did not drop accidentally from the sky. And then, if this be true, we may ask further whether the formation of this canon is not too early to allow of all the complex inrast is anism, at that denied ts the Thus Gospel denies adopt s later ranced for so Hatch.

faith, intenintenin the

of it:

1)-

s that ianity, gians, of the turns ament e case ed be nstead ugh to ament. more made olicism surely ection t of a er, the v were I then. tion of

lex in-

fluences being brought to bear which Dr. Hatch traces to the Hellenic mind; whether, that is, the spirit which dictated the formation of the canon is not continuous from the first. The Pauline and Johannine writings were on any showing completed and accepted as Apostolic very early—by the middle of the second century at latest—and it is inconceivable that they can have had no effect. They cannot have been less important or had less influence than the Gnostic writings, which

were eventually thrown aside.

1891

In passing to the question of speculation and dogma, and the influence of Hellenism upon these, we approach more difficult ground. The subject has not yet received, as Dr. Hatch truly says, the attention which it deserves, and might have been expected to attract. The Greek authors of the post-Christian age are not studied with anything like the completeness and care which have been spent upon the classics; and hence the real indebtedness of Christian writers to Greek thought has not been fully discussed. On this part of his subject our quarrel with Dr. Hatch is not connected with his statement of the Greek position. On the contrary, he has thoroughly studied his authors; the references he makes to them are to the point, his statement of their views accurate and clear. But we are prepared to maintain that the neglect of the evidence of the New Testament books has given a wrong bias to the whole question, and the value of the great mass of learning heaped up in the lectures on Greek Philosophy and Theology is largely cancelled by the use which has been made of it.

We have endeavoured to show that there are clear signs in the Christianity of the New Testament of that which was to come—clear signs that the newly-founded Church would take measures to prepare itself for fulfilling its Divine commission as a world-embracing creed. And we think that the actual history of dogma bears out this contention. There is, after all, a real function for dogmatic definition, and some such process is indispensable to any organized religious communion. Much emphasis has been laid upon the truth that the belief of the primitive Church was in certain facts. We cannot think that Dr. Hatch's account of this stage of Christian development is at all adequate. He tells us (pp. 313-5) that 'in the first instance the intellectual element of belief was subordinated to the ethical purpose of the religion. Belief was not insisted upon in itself and for itself, but as the ground of moral reformation. The main content of the belief was "that men are punished for their sins and honoured for their good deeds;" the ground of this conviction was the underlying belief that God is, and that He rewards and punishes.' Dr. Hatch admits, however, that there are some signs of a baptismal formula - 'in the name of the Three Persons of the Trinity,' or 'into the name of Christ' or 'into the death of Christ.' 'The next element,' he goes on, 'in the uncertainty which exists is as to how far the formula, either in the one case or the other, was conceived to involve the assent to any other propositions except those of the existence of the Divine Persons or Person mentioned in the formula. Even this assent was implied rather than explicit.' We have ventured to assume that the early Christians, when they used the formula, meant something by it. What they can have meant if they did not mean at least that the Persons named therein existed we do not know, and it seems to us a grave omission that neither Dr. Hatch nor his editors have offered a suggestion on this point. But to return to the formula. 'Concurrently with its use as a standard or test of belief was probably the incorporation in it of so much of Christian teaching as referred to the facts of the life of Jesus Christ.' Our belief is that the baptismal formula in its simplest and its more complex forms alike was necessary in order to retain possession of the facts. Dr. Hatch tells us that, at first, 'speculation was free. Different facts had a different significance. The same facts of the life were interpreted in different ways.... When theories were added to fact different theories were added.' All this we admit. There were theories added to the effect that Christ, being of Divine nature, could not have been born of the Blessed Virgin; could not have suffered pain, have been in contact with matter; could not have died. All this, it was urged, was mere appearance, unreal and illusory. And the answer of the Church to this was, No doubt you can make such fragments of our Gospels as you may think fit to acknowledge tell such a tale as that. But we do not believe that they mean that; we do not believe that this is the true account of the facts. To the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ we are pledged to bear witness, and this theory does away with them. And it was precisely the same later on when the Arian discussions arose. Up till that time the Church had been in the habit of worshipping Jesus Christ as God. The Godhead of Christ was implied as a fact in Christian worship. Whether it was definitely asserted or not, the adoration of Christ meant nothing less; we have assumed again that the Church had a meaning in what it did. Arius comes forward and offers to show that

nder-

ishes.'
of a

of the

th of tainty

e case

other Divine

1 this

tured d the

neant

nerein

ission

igges-Con-

f was

ristian

hrist.'

st and

retain first,

ignifi-

ferent

eories added

d not

died.

l and

s, No is you

of the

bear

it was

arose.

rship-

st was

s defi-

othing eaning

w that

But elieve the language of the Church involves or renders possible a different view of Christ's nature. 'You call Him Son,' he says: 'that means He is posterior in time to the Father—not, therefore, God at all.' And the Church in answer goes straight past the logic to the facts involved. It never deals with or worries over the logic. St. Athanasius, it is true, complains that Arius has forced the associations of man's transient nature into the Godhead; but he gives little time to this argument. His real point is this: If you worship Christ as God, when He is not, you are idolaters; there is no mean And the Council of Nicea determines to fix this position by the use of a term—not, perhaps, in itself wholly unobjectionable—which shall have this meaning and no other. Now surely, if this be true, it is idle to talk as if such definitions as that of the ὁμοούσιον were floated upon the world by the political 'belief in a majority of a meeting' (p. 331) together 'with the interposition of the State' (p. 345). Such an explanation does not account for the existence of a body of opinion on the subject at all. It practically assumes that those who insisted on this test-word—and we think Dr. Hatch has forgotten to mention against what degree of State pressure they did insist upon it—had no moral or spiritual interest whatever. They believed, no doubt, that they were right. They thought, like other men in their day, that metaphysics had a real meaning and a real right to be heard. This Dr. Hatch admits; but he denies, in effect, the connexion between their theology and their worship, and the priority of their worship to their theology. We do not believe that a serious study of St. Athanasius will leave the impression upon the mind that his interests were primarily metaphysical or speculative, or that his mind was guided by political considerations. He uses the terms which belong to his age, just as he uses the Greek language; but the thing he has at heart is the insult offered to the Godhead of the Son in saying that He is less than God.

This point, which we believe is established by the history of the Church, is further confirmed by the actual usage of terms. It is true that the Church adopts and uses terms belonging to current philosophic systems. It is not true that they are adopted without modification or reserve. The senses which they bore on Greek soil and in an atmosphere of Greek associations slowly change, and we find them used in a way which their old position would never have allowed. In this

¹ Cf. Or. c. Ar., 1. viii, II. xv, III. xvi. Also the references given in Newman's translation of these Orations, p. 193 note d, p. 423 note n.

connexion we must venture to enter a protest against the method of Dr. Hatch in his use of authorities. On a subject like this the evidence must be taken as a whole; the authorities should be considered not in isolation, but in a series. If it be true that words were adopted from Greek philosophy, and used at first in the sense the philosophers gave them, that is not the whole truth. Such terms are chosen in view of some point of contact between the truths of Christianity and the speculations of philosophers. When introduced into the Christian vocabulary they bring with them complex associations, latent suggestions of inference or development which are not at first perceived. If these become explicit it then becomes clear whether the term can be maintained in its old sense—whether, that is, the use of it introduces any changes in the facts which are the Christian heritage. If it does it must be modified. Though the very best logic may have been used to make the Church position easier and more intelligible, it can only be a deadening and impeding influence, unless it leaves the facts where they were. But the question whether this is so or not only arises when some thinker draws the inference or indicates the association which modifies the facts. Then the Church has to decide between logic and its own life. And it simply is not true to say that the Church has been committed to this or that deduction from terms which it adopts when the deduction has not been presented to its acceptance. To go back to an earlier instance, we may think it odd that it was reserved for Arius to point out the possible inferences from the term Son, but we have no right to say that they were tacitly accepted. The stir which was made when they appeared seems to us to imply not that they had been used without protest before, but that the instant they appeared they were seen to contradict a fact essential to the Church's being. To apply these principles in a particular case, we think it a misfortune that the evidence of St. Athanasius as to the use of terms has been so little taken He frequently throws light on the changes introduced into philosophical terminology by its contact with Christian facts. If we may sum up shortly the difference involved in the changed usage, it would lie in the addition of the notion of Personality. Personality in God and man are, philosophically speaking, essential thoughts to Christianity, and they are essential facts, we may say, in Christian experience. This position may be illustrated from the point of view of metaphysic and psychology.

It is a vexed question whether the Greek philosophical theologians allowed any Personality to God at all. It is

July st the thori-If it be d used ot the oint of ations ocabut sugt first clear nether. which dified. ke the y be a e facts or not dicates rch has is not or that on has Arius but we he stir nply ut that ples in ence of hanges ct with ference ition of an are, tianity,

expe-

oint of

ophical

. It is

difficult to believe that any final solution will be reached as to the exact meaning of this or that author. In the case of Plato there is much language which seems to assume that God is Personal; but, on the other hand, there is a tendency to identify or to confuse Him with the idea of good or perfection. Again, when Aristotle speaks of God as self-reflection (νόησις νοήσεως) one is inclined to think that the Personal idea has vanished. Yet we find Mr. Hutchison Stirling in his recent Giffard Lectures clamorous on the other side. Dr. Hatch, emphasizing the language of the Timæus, is clear that Plato's Demiurgus was meant to be a personal being, and that this conception of a transcendent Personality was the contribution of Plato to the evolution of the idea of God (cf. pp. 207-208). He takes the same view of the Stoic theology, especially in relation to the term Logos. He points out (p. 175) that the Stoics started with an antithesis between an active and passive principle ($\pi o \iota o \hat{\upsilon} \nu$ and $\pi \acute{a} \sigma \chi o \nu$). For the passive there comes to be substituted matter, for the active the Logos. 'But the majority of Stoics used neither the colourless term, the active, nor the impersonal term, the Logos. The Logos was vested with personality; the antithesis was between matter and God' (p. 176). Further on he explains the latter term thus:—

'He (i.e. God) is the sum of an infinite number of rational forces which are continually striving to express themselves through the matter with which they are in union. He is through them and in them working to realize an end. . . . The products are all divine, but not all equally divine. In His purest essence He is the highest form of mind in union with the most attenuated form of matter. In the lowest form of His essence He is the cohesive force which holds together the atoms of a stone.'

In this passage Dr. Hatch seems to have accepted a poor view of personality, and to have failed to do justice to the radical materialism of the Stoics. In no sense that we can understand is personality 'a sum of forces,' however rational. Even if the Stoic thinkers used the term 'God' habitually as a name for such an idea, we cannot feel that their use is justified. And, further, our opinion of the loftiness of the Stoic conception of God is somewhat dashed when we find that they regarded Him as material. The word \(\pi ve\tilde{v} \) \(\pi a \), usually employed to describe the nature of God, is certainly material in significance; \(^1 \) also it may be noted that the terms quoted by Dr. Hatch in a note on p. 177 from Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus are such as to suggest a material meaning. These facts are, perhaps, sufficient to indicate the

¹ Cf. Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 290, ed. 1879.

VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

DD

difficulty which attaches to the whole question of personality in Greek theology. It is possible, however, that some relief may be found if we consider what special ideas are involved in personality as applied to God. It would seem that there are two which that conception is intended to preserve. In the first place a personal God may be supposed capable of life and activity, and, next, is wholly separated from all blank and negative abstractions. We may find it difficult, perhaps, to conceive of activity except under the form of succession in time; but it is not necessary, if we accept the belief that God lives and acts and loves, to force these temporal associations upon our idea of Him. Again, it may be true that we cannot directly conceive any form of existence which should adequately describe the life of God; but that is not a reason for denying Him in effect any existence at all. Now if these notions may be supposed to belong to the conception of personality we think there can be no doubt whatever that Greek thought tended to move away from them. Now and again in Plato, in Aristotle, in the Stoics, even in Plotinus, we find language used which, strictly construed, implies personality. But in spite of this the general tendency of the thought of these writers is away from concreteness and individuality in the direction of abstraction and universality; and we think, moreover, that the Church in accepting the terminology made such modifications in its meaning as to suit it for its new work.

In the first place, the discussions out of which Greek philosophy arose gave it of necessity an anti-personal, antiindividual bias. Greek philosophy, it is hardly necessary to observe, dates back to Socrates. There were philosophers, and those influential and significant philosophers, before him; but his influence, exercised through Plato and Aristotle, was of decisive importance. And Socrates-this fact also has been mentioned before-spent his days in asking insoluble questions with exacting and inconvenient persistence. If a man used the terms 'just,' or 'good,' or 'beautiful,' he would insist on knowing what they precisely meant-would always press for such a definition of the term employed as would account for its use in all cases where it was applicable. It was owing to this practice that Aristotle assigns to him the merit of discovering general definitions and inductive reasonings.1 This meant, of course, that the definition, when attained, would express the common element in a number of individual

¹ Met. M. iv. 1078, b. 28. δύο γάρ ἐστιν ἄ τις ἃν ἀποδοίη Σωκράτει δικαίως, τοὺς τ' ἐπακτικοὺς λόγους καὶ τὸ ὁρίζεσθαι καθόλου.

nality relief rolved there e. In ble of blank rhaps, sion in at God iations cannot d adeson for f these tion of er that ow and nus, we es perof the ss and rsality; ing the g as to

Greek al, antissary to sophers, re him; otle, was ilso has nsoluble e. If a e would always as would able. It him the e reasonattained, ndividual

τει δικαίως,

things; their separate and peculiar characteristics would not be in question. The development of Plato upon this basis is of the most vital importance. What Socrates had held to be real knowledge, Plato treated as knowledge of the real. These abstract ideas or forms, which were to explain the world for Socrates, constituted it in Plato. And so we gradually reach the position that the abstract is the real; it is that which gives the particular concrete material details their meaning. All definite particularity is a falling short of the purity of the ideal form, involves an element of confusion and falsity; the abstract alone is the true. And thenfurther, the things we see around us, the embodiments in matter of the abstract forms, are subject to change and decay; and here again they fall short as compared with the forms which are eternal and changeless. In this short sketch of the point of view of Plato we do not think we have used language which cannot be justified in his writings. And already there are present the germs of a much fuller development; already reality is given over into the hands of an abstract logical classification; we begin to look already for a supremely real existence which shall transcend all known forms of being; moreover, with the individual vanish also movement and life; the real must be still and changeless. This step, which Plato probably never took, was certainly taken by Plotinus. Aristotle had endeavoured, with a rather uncertain hand, to give back reality to the individual thing. But, if we may believe Zeller, he never decided absolutely which was the most vital element, matter or form. The Categories, if they are his in any real sense, certainly make the individual the 'essence in the first and best sense;' but such a commentary as that of Porphyry upon the Categories shows how difficult this was felt to be.2 But, in spite of this attempt to restore the individual, Plotinus, deeply influenced as he was by Aristotle, returns to the notion that form alone is better and truer than form expressed in matter; and he goes even further, placing the ground of reality beyond what we call existence in the region of the $\mu \dot{\eta} \ddot{\delta} \nu$. Matter and individuality, and change or movement, alike involve a degradation; knowledge of the primal Cause, or Good, is only attained through a solution of the individual self in ecstasy. That this was the tendency of Greek idealism as it actually displayed itself in

1 Phil. d. Griech. Bd. iii. p. 348.

² Dr. Hatch rightly notices that this point of view is not maintained in the *Metaphysics*, p. 1037 b. In this passage $\pi\rho\dot{\omega}\tau\eta$ où $\sigma\dot{\omega}$ is used of the form.

history we suppose would scarcely be denied. A similarly anti-personal result follows from the position of the Greek materialists, the Stoics. We have already pointed out how deeply ingrained in their system was their belief in the universal extent of matter. They were not, of course, averse to thinking of this, their first principle, as being subject to change; but they practically destroyed all sense of individuality in things or persons by teaching the doctrine of successive cycles in which the single Substance-God or Fire or Matter-manifested itself in a series of forms recurring without cessation or change. The history of the world recurred in periods. In each there were repeated precisely the same That fragment of the divine substance known as Socrates would again appear as son of Sophroniscus, again spend his life in asking questions, and be condemned again to the draught of hemlock. Origen (C. Cels. iv. 67-8) points out that upon this theory all freedom and responsibility vanish; each person in each period works out mechanically his contribution to the whole. And we may surely extend this argument. Not only does responsibility vanish, but there vanishes too all the reality which belongs to individual and personal life. The import of every moral act is single and peculiar: something is effected by it. Every temptation vielded to or overcome has a definite result for evil or good; the permanent, undying, individual self is different—worse or better—for it. A man's life is his own peculiar property, his own distinctive product. But all this goes if life recurs in mechanical cycles. It has no meaning; our thoughts about it have no reality, no correspondence with anything in fact. It is an aimless, objectless, unintelligible mechanism, in which all interest is simply a delusion and a lie. We think, then, that the tendency of Greek philosophy, whatever its language, lay in the direction of the extermination of individual life by means of formulæ which obliterated distinction or denied The systems were, as Dr. Hatch truly says of Stoicism, explanations 'of things as they are,' while Christianity from the first meant the introduction of a new life. They aim merely at an analysis of the given: they do not recognize any breach of continuity, any absolute beginning, any real change. But Christianity from the first begins outside the material order, thinks of a Divine Purpose moving in things, of a world not fully answering to the Divine Idea corrected by the infusion of new vigour, of human wills tried and proved by the pressure of circumstances. In the one case metaphysical, in the other moral considerations are preGreek

t how

n the

averse

ect to

indi-

ine of

r Fire

urring

curred

same

wn as

, again

lagain

points

sibility

nically

extend

t there

ial and

gle and

ptation

good;

orse or

rty, his

curs in

s about

in fact.

n which

k, then,

nguage,

l life by

denied

says of

e Chris-

new life.

do not

ginning,

ins out-

oving in

ne Idea

ills tried

the one

are pre-

dominant. This was the secret of the changed front which

the old terms display.

1891

The invariable sign of the presence of the abstract metaphysical conception of God is the difficulty which attaches to the conception of creation. It is not strange that this should be so. The philosophies of Greece are, for the most part, as we have just observed, 'an analysis or explanation of the world as it is;' and they have not room, therefore, for the notion of the world coming into being. They are admirable so long as we think only of a permanent condition of things, pendent, as it were, before the mind of God, or swaying backwards and forwards with a ceaseless rise and fall. If the barely abstract and changeless be the real it is difficult to conceive any motives or reasons for movement towards the material and changing. The fact that the embodied state was intrinsically worse than the abstract incorporeal condition gave this question the additional importance that it dealt with the problem of evil metaphysically. One method by which the gap between God and the world was bridged has been rightly described by Dr. Hatch as 'the hypothesis of evolution.' connexion with this hypothesis we continually meet with words well known to theology: λόγος, εἰκών, γεννάω. At the risk of being tedious it will be worth while to illustrate by means of these terms our position as to the relation of Greek and Christian theology.

For their use on the Greek side we must go back to We find that the word λόγος has two meanings: (1) Speech. It is διανοίας εν φωνή ώσπερ είδωλον (Soph. 262, D). It is the expression in sound of a process of thought completed within the soul (της ψυχης προς αύτην διάλογος ἄνευ φωνής γενόμενος); this is called διάνοια, but when emerging into sound is called λόγος: τὸ δέ γ' ἀπ' ἐκείνης [i.e. the soul] ρεύμα διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐὸν μετὰ φθόγγου κέκληται λόγος (Soph. 263, E). (2) λόγος means a sentence consisting at least of subject and predicate (Crat. 431, B). Closely akin (probably) to this sense, and tending towards that of theory or reason, is the use of λόγος for a definition. The phrases λόγον διδόναι and λόγος της οὐσίας might take, it would seem, one or other shade of meaning—might mean the account in the sense of the description, or in the sense of the ground or principle. Lastly, the word means the faculty of reason. These senses are distinct, no doubt; but they are not so distinct as the English words by which we describe them. They form part of the regular associations of the word. Plat. Rep. 534, B-C, is a passage, too long for citation, in which we have

close together three different senses of the word. The manwho seizes του λόγου της οὐσίας έκάστου is the διαλεκτικός: he is able λόγον διδόναι when called upon; he separates τω $\lambda \delta \gamma \omega$ (by reason) the idea of good from other things. In the sense of word horos is an sixwo of that which exists; we imitate διὰ συλλαβῶν καὶ γραμμάτων τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν πραγμάτων (Crat. 431, D). And our image is a good or a bad one according as the imitation is done well or badly; but in any case an εἰκῶν always falls short of its original: οὐ παράπαν δεί πάντα ἀποδοῦναι, οἰόν ἐστιν ὅ εἰκάζει, εἰ μέλλει εἰκών εἰναι (Crat. 432, B). An image of Cratylus, Socrates argues, which resembled him not only externally, but internally too, would cease to be an είκων: πότερον Κρατύλος αν και είκων Κρατύλου τότ' είη τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἡ δύο Κρατύλοι ; ΚΡ. Δύο ἔμοιγε δοκοῦσιν. & Σώκρατες, Κρατύλοι (432, C). This conception of the εἰκών is carried out when it is applied to the relations of the κοσμὸς νοητὸς and the κόσμος αἰσθητός. The latter is a blurred copy of the former. The sensible world stands further off than the intellectual from the direct activity of the Demiurgus: it is ζωον όρατον τὰ όρατὰ περιέχον, εἰκών τοῦ νοητοῦ θεὸς αἰσθητὸς ... μονογένης ών (Tim. 92, C). The process by which it is produced is called γεννάω. This word is used first (Tim. 41. A) of the production of the intellectual world of which this is a copy: λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ τόδε τὸ πᾶν γεννήσας τάδε. Later on yevvntos is used of this world in close connexion with alσθητόs (Tim. 52, A). The cases quoted come, it will be observed, at once from very widely different dialogues. It might, therefore, be urged that they are of no importancethat Plato's usage may have varied, and that we cannot allege these sporadic phrases as characteristic in any special degree This might be so were it not that in other later writers the same group of words occurs in the same relations. Whatever Plato may have meant, the words stuck together, especially in authors strongly under Plato's influence. It must be observed with regard to them that they are metaphorical, almost poetical; that the salient point in the use of the word εἰκων is that it marks a difference—a want of similarity as well as similarity compared with the original.

Aristotle is, indeed, an important person to omit; but it must be confessed that he affords little assistance towards the unravelling of the history of this group of terms. He avoids metaphorical and poetical in a great measure, and though the word $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau \delta s$ occurs some few times in the *Metaphysics* and elsewhere we cannot lay much stress upon it. It is mostly found in contexts which suggest that the common clerical

ne man ετικός: ates τω In the sts; we ραγμάad one in any αράπαν ών είναι , which , would ρατύλου οκοῦσιν, ης είκων εκοσμός red copy than the us: it is αἰσθητὸς hich it is Tim. 41, ch this is e. Later ion with t will be gues. It ortancenot allege al degree ther later relations.

July-

nilarity as nit; but it wards the He avoids shough the obspics and t is mostly on clerical

together,

aphorical,

the word

It must

error by which γεννητὸs is substituted for γενητόs may have had some influence. So we pass on to the Stoics. Their doctrine of the hóyos is very famous. It is allied to that sense of λόγος in earlier writers which we have translated Reason. The λόγος of the world is the immanent principle of Reason, which governs all the changes. The insistence on the rational aspect of the world does not prevent the hoyos being material. It is of the nature of fire. Seeds of it are hidden in individual things (σπερματικοί λόγοι), and maintain them in being; and these may be regarded as self-expressions of the universal The process by which the world comes into being as a development of the λόγος του κόσμου is called γεννάν, and the reconstruction of things after their periodical dissolution is παλιγγενεσία and αποκατάστασις (Zeller, Phil. d. Griech. Bd. iv. pp. 149-60, and his reff.; also M. Aurel. xi. 1 for παλιγγενεσία). A highly important pair of words seems to be traceable to the Stoics: λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός. This contrast is parallel to that already cited from Plato (Soph. 263, E) between διάνοια and λόγος, and may be compared with the Aristotelian distinction between ὁ ἔξω λόγος and ὁ ἐν τῆ ψυχῆ (cf. Anal. Post. i. x.) It became important in connexion with the question of the Son of God in creation.

The writings of Philo form the next stage in our journey; and they are of the greatest importance, because in him we trace the operation of three separate lines of thought-the Stoic, the Platonic, the Judaic. It will be unnecessary here to discuss Philo's general position; we are concerned primarily only with the recurrence in his writings, and the relations, of certain terms. We need only observe that he accepts the Platonic view of the superiority of the intellectual over the sensible, and regards God as absolute Reality—τὸ ὄν. He denies the Stoic pantheism; the world, he tells us, is not ὁ πρῶτος θεός, but του πρώτου θεού δημιούργημα (De Migr. Abr. 35). God is wholly unlike man, and all anthropomorphic expressions must be explained away. Hence there is no name by which we can describe God. σκεψάμενος εἴ ἐστί τι τοῦ "Οντος ὄνομα, σαφως έγνω ὅτι κύριον μὲν οὐδέν ὁ δ΄ ἄν εἴπη τις καταχρώμενος έρει λέγεσθαι γαρ οὐ πέφυκεν, άλλα μόνον είναι το "Ον (De Somn. i. 39). It will be noticed that these statements come perilously near denying the reality of God. It is in order to bring this remote and inconceivable Being into communion with the world that the theory of the λόγος in Philo is devised. Fortunately it is not necessary to enter into all the difficulties which surround Philo's treatment of the Divine Word. We may start with facts upon which all are agreed, viz. that the λόγοs is sometimes regarded as a single Power, sometimes as the head of a group of powers, which represent sometimes the ideas of Plato, sometimes seem more closely akin to the σπερματικοί λόγοι of Stoicism, sometimes again are identified with the Jewish angels. Always they are intermediate between the abstract and remote Deity and the concrete world; they are an expedient for reversing the process by which the standpoint as to the Divine Nature has been reached. Among the multitude of phrases descriptive of the process of creation we must refer only to a few. The sensible world is an ἀπεικόνισμα of the κόσμος νοητός, which is intermediate between the Demiurgus and the material world (De Opif. Mund. ch. iv.) In the same treatise (ch. viii.) the κόσμος νοητὸς is represented as an εἰκων of the Divine λόγος, and the λόγος as an εἰκῶν θεοῦ. So the Logos stands midway between the world and God, ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατήρ (Quis Rer. Div. 42). Also he is the instrument of creation: σκιὰ θεοῦ δὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν, ῷ καθάπερ ὀργάνφ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει.

(Leg. Alleg. iii. 31).

One more writer must be laid under contribution, and then we shall have finished the Greek side of the history. This writer shall be Plotinus, the great Neo-Platonist. In Enn. V. viii. 12 there is a long passage describing the emergence of the world from the ultimate principle. Here the world is described as $\pi a \hat{i} s$, from the contemplation of which we can infer what the πατήρ is like. It is also an εἰκων, but so far falls short of the archetype; also the primary principle is said to beget it $(\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{a} \nu)$. Further, the $\psi \nu \chi \dot{\eta} \tau o \hat{\nu} \kappa \dot{\rho} \sigma \mu o \nu$, which is the third factor in the so-called Trinity of Plotinus, is described as λόγος and εἰκων in relation to the second (Enn. v. i. 3). These λόγοι or εἰκόνες are, according to Plotinus, worse than that from which they spring; that is, further from the primal negation which is beyond all idea of existence that we have (cf. v. i. 7). Here we have precisely the same points to notice as those in Plato: the generation of an elkov is the generation of a thing which does not share all the qualities of its original, and on that account is fitted to stand between a perfectly abstract God and a concrete material world. It should be observed that this process of generation does not take place in time: ἐκποδών δὲ ἡμῖν ἔστω ἡ γένεσις ἡ ἐν χρόνω τὸν λόγον περὶ τῶν ἀεὶ ὄντων ποιουμένοις (Plot. Enn. V. i. 6). Thus the simple Platonic idea of an Artificer Deity passes into a pantheism. We do not, therefore, quite feel the force of Dr. Hatch's remarks on p. 208, where the conception of God as Artificer is ascribed to Platonism and opposed to that of an immanent Cause. The truth

nes as

the co

iden-

ediate

ch the

mong f crea-

is an

Mund. ητὸs is

yos as

en the

iv. 42). λόγος

οποίει.

d then

ence of

orld is

n infer

s short

beget

e third s λόγος

ε λόγοι

which

which

m that

od and

at this

ιποδών δυτων

nic idea

do not, p. 208,

to Pla-

e truth

Here Plato:

This Enn.

1891

is that Plato's language does not correctly represent the tendency of his philosophy. The position of Plotinus is a stage beyond that of Philo, and that of Philo is more marked than that of Plato. Doubtless Philo shrinks from that complete identification of God with the μη ον which we find in Plotinus; but he is on the verge of it in his Platonic moods. This simply means that the inherent tendency of the Platonic Metaphysics, however successfully concealed in Plato by poetical phraseology, is asserting itself in Philo, and emerges unmodified in Plotinus. And the idea of Personality vanishes before it. This is borne out by the change noticeable in the motive, if we may use the expression, assigned by Plato and Plotinus respectively for the creation of the world. In Plato it is kindly feeling: God is good and did not grudge existence to things, and so He gave it to them. Similarly in Philo a moral motive is suggested. In Plotinus it is a mechanical process: the over-fulness $(\tau \delta \hat{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s)$ of the primary being, as it were, overflowed (οἶον ὑπερρύη), and this set in motion the processes of development, and this happens in obedience to the law of self-propagation which we observe throughout

Let us now turn to the Christian movement. It will be quite impossible in the space at our disposal to put down all the evidence there is upon the subject. We shall only endeavour to show by citations from typical Christian writers that the tendency of the Christian thought is not in the same direction. The first passages come from Clement of Rome. Of him St. Irenæus writes (Adv. Hær. III. iii. 3) that he was in closest connexion with the Apostles; 'he had seen them and conferred with them; he had their preaching still sounding in his ears, their tradition before his eyes.' In the first epistle there are two passages, both connected with the creation, and containing, one the word loyos, the other the word είκών. The language in both is closely allied to that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and may imply, therefore, the influence of Greek thought. We cannot be sure that the use of the words is technical; but it is almost more important to our argument that it should be allied to the language of Scripture. The passages are as follows: c. xxvii. ἐν λόγω της μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγω δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι: and c. xxxiii. ἄνθρωπον ταίς ίεραις και αμώμοις χερσιν έπλασεν της έαυτου εικόνος χαρακ-

¹ Enn. V. ii. I: πρώτη οἷον γέννησις αὕτη· ὃν γὰρ (τὸ ἐν) τέλειον τῷ μηδὲν ζητεῖν μηδὲ ἔχειν μηδὲ δεῖσθαι, οἷον ὑπερρύη· καὶ τὸ ὑπερπλῆρες αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ἄλλο.

τῆρα. The facts are stated here quite simply, and in language which travels but slightly outside the words of Scripture. In the so-called second epistle we have a remarkable assertion (ch. ix.) of the pre-existence of the Son: Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος, ό σώσας ήμας, ῶν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα, ἐγένετο σάρξ. passage presents the same characteristics. In the Ignatian Letter to the Magnesians, ch. viii., there is a remarkable phrase connected with the use of the word $\lambda \delta \gamma os$: ϵls $\theta \epsilon \delta s$ ό φανερώσας έαυτον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υίοῦ αὐτου, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγής προελθών. δε κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν. The language here is ordinarily used, as Bishop Lightfoot remarks, of creation; this was the silence out of which the utterance of God emerged; but the context shows that here it is applied to the Incarnation. Owing to the special significance given to this class of phrases in later days, the reading has been altered by scribes, and a different expression used by the interpolater of the Long Recension of the Ignatian Epistles. In another passage in the Ignatian Letters (Eph. vii.) the word γεννητὸs is used of the Son of God. Here again a distinction, common in the more accurate phraseology of later days, is not made. The context shows that the word means 'created;' it refers to the human nature of our Lord, and would more naturally have been expressed in the more developed language of the Church by γενητός. St. Ignatius teaches the pre-existence quite clearly (Magn. vi.; Polyc. iii.); there is no sign that he in any way identified the Word of God with the world. Further, the Incarnation, which is the chief subject of his thought, is represented as having occurred δι' ἡμᾶs (Polyc. iii.) Here, then, and in St. Clement of Rome we have the simple direct conception of God and His relation to the world. Roughly speaking, the creation of the world by the Logos, the fact that the Logos is an Image of the Father, and that He became Incarnate, are points of view which are quite common from the days of the Apostolic Fathers onwards. It will not, therefore, be worth our while to multiply illustrations of this

This view of the nature of Christ before the Incarnation is of very great importance. It reappears in Ign. Eph. vii., and occurs in various authors till the fourth century. References may be found in Lightfoot's note on 2 Clem. ix. It is important for two reasons: (1) because it connects itself with the doctrine that God is Spirit; and (2) because this sense of Spirit is, we believe, essentially non-Hellenic. The word $\pi\nu\epsilon\bar{\nu}\mu a$ has a material significance always, so far as we can find, in Plato, in the Stoic writings, and in Plotinus, very commonly also in Philo. The Greek opposition lay not between $\sigma a\rho \xi$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\bar{\nu}\mu a$, but between $a\tilde{\iota}\sigma \theta \eta \sigma u$ and $\nu\nu\bar{\nu}s$, $a\tilde{\iota}\delta os$ and $v\lambda \eta$.

1891

anguage are. In ssertion κύριος, This Ignatian narkable Els Beòs ος έστιν ρέστησεν ily used, was the but the arnation. phrases es, and a he Long issage in s used of n in the de. The refers to ally have e Church te clearly any way ther, the ought, is .) Here, ple direct Roughly , the fact t He becommon

on is of very rs in various a Lightfoot's cause it concecause this word πνεῦμα Plato, in the Philo. The reen αἴσθησις

t will not,

ns of this

The point which we have to make out is that, in spite of the close similarity in language between the Fathers and the philosophers, there is a serious underlying difference in idea. We have seen the position occupied by this doctrine among the Greek philosophers-how it was bound up with their philosophical traditions and associations, and how the inherent tendency of these came out into open daylight in Plotinus. We have seen, too, the unreasoned and direct use of some of these words in those Christian writers who come nearest to the Apostles; and we admit the use of definitely philosophical language in later Fathers, borrowed, there can be little doubt, directly from the philosophers. If. then, side by side with this we find expressions and ideas akin rather to the Scriptural than to the philosophical way of looking at things, and if we find, further, that'in a certain class of authors, to whom the Church has always pointed as authorities, the Scriptural expressions and forms of thought gradually attain the mastery—gradually bring about a change of meaning and association in terms still retained in the technical vocabulary of theology—we shall see good reason for refusing to regard the Gnostics as the victorious party in the Church, or the Montanists or the communities of the Teaching as its primitive ideal, or the speculations of Greek thinkers as the proper source of Christian theology. The crucial points are these: the meaning of incomprehensibility as applied especially to God the Father; the explanation of creation and history as a moral order; the preexistence of the Word, in the completeness of the Godhead, to creation and all that follows from it. We must again apologize for the unavoidable incompleteness of our presentation of the evidence.

First of all let us consider Hermæ Pastor. The author of this work lays considerable emphasis on the creation; and in view of his language about it it is not difficult to see why. Thus, Mand. XII. iv. 2, we read: οὐ νοεῖε τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πῶς μεγαλὴ ἐστὶ καὶ ἰσχυρὰ καὶ θαυμαστή, ὅτι ἔκτισε τὸν κόσμον ἔνεκα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ ὑπέταξε τῷ ἀνθρώπω καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τοῦ κατακυριεύειν τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανον πάντων; In Mand. I. i. God is contrasted in His nature with creation: εἶε ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἶς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ πάντα χωρῶν, μόνος δὲ ἀχώρητος ὧν (cf. Sim. IX. xiv. 5). In Vis. I. i. 3 this is done ἔνεκεν τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ (cf. Vis. I. iii. 4). Again, the Son of God existed before the Incarnation, and was the

1

e

a

e

C

0

0

b

0

q

in

p

al

CO

SE

di

0

al

of

to

pł

tic

bu

B

CE

pl

H

G

S

bo

of

Instrument of creation (Sim. V. vi. 5): τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον τὸ προόν, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, κατψκισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σαρκὰ ἢν ἐβούλετο 1 (cf. a very strong passage, Sim. IX. xii. 2, in which the Son is described as προγενέστερος πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, and σύμβουλος τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ.

We next come to Justin Martyr. This writer has the reputation of being deeply influenced by Greek thought, and this not without reason. At the same time he answers all the tests which we have laid down above; there is certainly present in his thought an element which does not spring from Greek philosophy, and is traceable to Scripture usage. Strictly speaking, it would be necessary to refer only to one passage to show the presence of these ideas (Apol. II. c. vi.) There we learn that no name can be given to God, since He is άγέννητος: that the titles Father and God, &c., are not names άλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποιϊῶν καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσρήσεις: that the Son, ό μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υίὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνών καὶ γεννώμενος, became incarnate according to the will and counsel of the Father ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστευόντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῶν δαιμόνων. But we may well compare Apol. I. x., where the nature of God is given as the explanation of worship. He does not require anything of us, for He gives us all we have; but 'we have been taught, and persuaded to believe, that He receives those only who imitate the good attributes which belong to Him-temperance and justice and love of men, καὶ ὅσα οἰκεῖα θεῷ ἐστὶ, τῷ μηδένι ὀνόματι θέτω καλουμένω' (cf. Apol. I. lxi. 94, D, where the baptismal formula is illustrated). These passages, we think, are clear enough for their purpose; but we must not leave Justin without referring to his doctrine that the world was created ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης. This theory connects him with Philo, and seems to imply a belief in the co-eternity of matter with God. The statement is made in Apol. I. x., a passage already cited. It is repeated in similar terms in two other places in the same work. It seems, however, from c. lix. that Justin regarded the first verse of Genesis as describing the creation of this ἄμορφος ὕλη (cf. ch. lxiv.), so that we cannot feel certain that he would have accepted Philo's language quite unmodified.

The doctrine of Irenæus is far too full and clear upon the various heads we have mentioned to be properly treated in passing. The relation of the Holy Trinity to creation is

¹ That this passage refers to the Son and not to the Holy Spirit is proved by the context, and is illustrated by the passage quoted above from 2 Clem.

äγιον ાંક રાંક kii. 2, S THS

July

s the , and rs all tainly from rictly ssage There He is ames Son, ου καὶ

o the v åvv well is the of us, t, and nitate d jusόματι tismal clear lustin reated , and God.

cited. in the in reeation t feel quite

on the ted in ion is Spirit is above stated, for instance, beyond all doubt whatever in IV. xx. I: 'Adest enim ei [i.e. Deo] semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et in quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit. ad quos et loquitur, dicens: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; ipse a semetipso substantiam creaturarum, et exemplum factorum, et figuram in mundo ornamentorum accipiens.' But the most important fact about St. Irenæus in this connexion is his statement of a doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which he refers to some older authority, but which it is extremely difficult to trace. Having observed (Hær. IV. iv. 2) that God does everything by measure and order, he then remarks, 'bene qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum; mensura enim Patris, Filius, quoniam et capit eum.' What this seems to prove is that within the Church there is a process of reflection going on, in some independent lines to those prevalent in Greek The tendency towards a greater degree of philosophy. abstraction in the conception of God is being reversed: the conviction of His Personality and independence of the world

is growing in intensity.

The writers we have been considering thus far have presented the phenomena of a Scriptural theory of things with some clearness. The authors whom we must now briefly discuss are far more difficult to estimate. Clement and Origen were both brought up in the philosophic air of Alexandria, and it must be confessed that they seem to have allowed their philosophy too free a range over the province of the Faith. In Clement (Strom. v. xii. 82, 83) we have a description of the nature of God, which it would be difficult to surpass in abstractness even in the purely pagan philosophers. God is a pure monad, without any conceivable relations or attributes or accidents. He is also ἐπέκεινα τοῦ ἐνὸς. but apparently is not called ἐπέκεινα της οὐσίας (cf. Bigg, Bampton Lectures, p. 63, n. 2). So, again, the Son is the Consciousness of God—the circle of which the Father is the central point (Strom. IV. xxv. 158). At the same time, in spite of this unconditional surrender to the forces of Greek philosophy, there are points at which Clement draws the line. He denies, for instance (Strom. V. i. 6), the application to God of the distinction between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικόs, possibly in the interests of the co-eternity of the Son. And this latter truth he asserts earlier in the same book (V. i. I). On the other hand, it must be admitted that in V. iii. 16 he writes as if the Word came forth for the sake of creation: προελθών δημιουργίας αίτιος. It is noticeable

th

ar

th

A

ha

w

bo

no

m

ce

cle

ga

the

un

cai

COI

dri

on

it r

the

It s

vid

wor

Chr

med

rela

sim

-in

Chr

tiani

indiv

worth

They

that he uses $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ for substance. Also he denies the eternity and pre-existence of matter. It would seem, then, that in him we have a perilous compromise between philosophy and theology, according to which philosophy is, on the whole, supreme. With Origen, in spite of his reputation for unorthodoxy, there is more of critical discernment, less readiness to commit himself. There are signs enough in his thought of the influence of Plato and Platonism—the transcendence of God, the eternity of creation—and some survivals of Docetism in connexion with the Person of our Lord. Yet there are very definite assertions of the reality of the revelation through the Incarnate Christ; and Origen does not shrink any more than Justin from assigning moral motives to God, changeless and transcendent though He be (cf. C. Cels. IV. xiv.—xvii.)

It will be observed that the other authors cited before Clement and Origen have belonged to a different part of the world to these. Rome, Ephesus, Palestine, Gaul are their To them we might add Tertullian, as representing homes. These writers are all engaged in their way upon the one Faith; in all of them we find Trinitarian doctrine more or less clearly expressed. And none show the unmodified influence of Greek philosophy. There are signs that the Alexandrine Church was in some considerable degree isolated from its neighbours. It retained to a late date the College of Presbyter Bishops, the habit of celebrating the Agape in the evening; and, if we may believe recent textual criticism, the type of text prevalent in Alexandria was of limited circulation as compared with the Western, which ranged from Asia Minor to Gaul. May we add to these signs of isolation the tendency to surrender Christian verities under the pressure of philosophy, which seems to have been so much more prominent in Alexandria than elsewhere? It was not the permanent characteristic of the Church. It is Eusebius of Cæsarea, the devoted admirer of Origen, who sets forth the various senses of the word Aóyos, and decides which is theologically tolerable (C. Marc. de Eccl. Theol. II. ix. x.); and it is Athanasius who insists that εἰκων, when applied to Christ, is intended to emphasize, not difference, as from Plato to Plotinus, but absolute similarity with God the Father (C. Ar. i. 21).

We have now seen the inadequacy of Dr. Hatch's conception of his subject in two distinct parts of it; he has not described Christianity successfully, nor realized its influence on Greek thought. As regards the first of these, we think he would probably have offered to defend his position somewhat

XUM

July

eter-

that ophy

hole,

rtho-

ess to

ht of

ice of etism

very

h the

than

s and

pefore

of the

their

enting

on the

more

dified

at the

olated

ollege

ape in

ticism,

circu-

n Asia

on the

sure of

minent

nanent

ea, the

senses

olerable us who

to em-

bsolute

i's con-

has not

ıfluence

in the following way. In the lecture on the 'Greek Mysteries' (p. 300) we find the following statement:—

'Baptism had felt the spell of the Greek ritual: not less so had the Lord's Supper. Its elements in the earliest times may be gathered altogether apart from the passages of the New Testament, upon which, however clearly we may feel, no sensible man will found an argument, and which, taken by themselves, possibly admit of more than one meaning.'

We are, therefore, handed over to the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles and other extra-Biblical accounts. That which he has explicitly and consciously done here, he has done implicitly throughout. And it seems as if this would be the line upon which he would justify his presentation of the problem. books of the New Testament are many of them under discussion as to their date and authorship; their interpretation is no less uncertain and disputed. Their evidence, therefore, must be left aside until all these questions are settled. It is certainly true that by this means things become simpler and clearer; but we doubt whether exposition thus carried on gains in certainty or truth. Supposing for the moment that the account of Greek thoughts and usages were entirely unexceptionable, yet still these are confessedly not the only causes at work. The theory which results from the one-sided consideration of these is the theory which we might have been driven to hold if all Christian literature had vanished, but only on these conditions. Surely it cannot be valid, as things are.

We have spoken already of Dr. Hatch's critical position; it remains to enquire what philosophical position emerges as the support and basis of his treatment of Church history. It seems to be expressed in two prominent tendencies—individualism in religion, mechanism (if we may use this Hegelian word) in life. The religion which he seems to think that Christ meant to found was one which dispensed with all earthly media, and placed the single individual soul in an ethical relation with God. The Church, according to his theory, was simply a body of loosely attached individuals, who all agreed—in view of some relation, not clearly explained, with Jesus Christ—to lay aside their sins and live a moral life.

'There is no adequate evidence that in the first age of Christianity association was other than voluntary. It was profoundly individual. It assumed, for the first time in human history, the infinite worth of the individual soul. The ground of that individual worth was a divine sonship. And the sons of God were brethren. They were drawn together by the constraining force of love. But

hink he mewhat

u

V

p

il

H

ta

V

th

th

ca

pr

W

de

ca

If

as

ch

Ch

A

int

rev

ga

the

Ni

me

wa:

to :

we

and

fica

Nic

wit.

and

foll

tha

thir

the clustering together under that constraining force was not necessarily the formation of an association.'

The earliest associations were drawn together on a basis of 'a fellowship of a common ideal and a common enthusiasm of goodness, of neighbourliness, and of mutual service, &c.' Possibly even the baptismal formula 'may have consisted, not in an assertion of belief, but in a promise of amendment;' at least this was the case in 'a conservative sect' known to Church history as the Elkasaite heretics (p. 337). One of the causes which led to the change of this state of things was the fact 'that baptism was conceived to have in itself an efficacy which in later times has been rarely attached to it. . . . It was a real washing away of sins; it was a real birth into a new life; it was a real adoption into a divine sonship' (p. 342; cf. pp. 162-3). The tendency of this and much else in the book is in the direction of the position maintained by Dr. Martineau in his Seat of Authority. The distaste for anything which seems to interfere with the solitariness of the individual soul is there definitely expressed. And Dr. Hatch seems to feel a somewhat similar repulsion. Definitions of doctrine, organization of communities alike interfere with the primitive simplicity of the purely ethical religion. He contends for the unbounded freedom of the individual to think and order his life precisely as he pleases. All definiteness and close union are fettering. We can, in a measure, understand the feeling that the organization of an external community may limit individual motions. An arm or a leg would, no doubt, be more independent and free when separated from the body; and perhaps it is surprising that no one has ever thought of this conclusive rejoinder to St. Paul's analogy of the body and its parts. But we totally fail to see how the definition of a doctrine, supposing the doctrine is true and the definition adequate, interferes with individual freedom. Yet on this subject we have one of Dr. Hatch's most remarkable utterances. 'A definition of what has been hitherto undefined is necessarily of the nature of an addition' (p. 327). Surely, if the definition is true, it adds nothing whatever to the thing defined; and if it adds anything to the thing defined, it is a false definition. If you believe that Christ is God, you impose no additional burden on yourself by saying that this means He is consubstantial with the Father, and that there is a radical difference of opinion between you and those who say either that He is not consubstantial, or not God. It is only to those who deny your propositions, claim to share your worship, call themselves by the name of Christ, and describe

neces-

sis of

siasm

, &c.'

d, not

;' at

vn to of the

s was

elf an

to it.

birth

iship'

h else

ed by

te for

of the

Hatch

ons of

ith the

ntends

k and

ss and

erstand

nunity

uld, no

d from

as ever logy of

ow the

and the

. Yet

arkable

defined

Surely,

e thing

, it is a

impose

means

ere is a

vho sav

is only

re your

describe

the difference as unessential, that the sentence of exclusion may seem hard, even though it corresponds to fact. If it be urged that the fact of there being a time when no definition existed implies that the Faith was indefinite, then we reply,

That is the very point in dispute.

As a corollary of this individualism we have a mechanical view of history. The editor of these Lectures remarks in the preface that the mind of Dr. Hatch was one 'to which every species of mechanical Deism was alien.' This observation is illustrated by some remarks of Dr. Hatch himself in Lect. xi. He there censures and sets aside the view that 'the interpretation of the Divine Voice was developed gradually through three centuries, and that it was then suddenly arrested' (p. 332). We may suppose that this view is regarded as being that of the ordinary orthodox Christian. If it were there is no doubt that it would be Deism. The separation of God's control and care from any part or period of human life is deistic in tendency. But what are we to say of history on Dr. Hatch's principles? Can we ascribe to the hand of God a process which works itself out through 'majorities in meetings,' aided by the police, and succeeds only in swamping and almost destroying that which is the 'sum of Christianity'? We cannot, surely, say that God was governing such a process. If He meant only to renovate the 'lonely pieties of individuals,' as Dr. Martineau calls them, surely the means were strangely chosen. The moment Christ is gone, the externalizing of His Church in organization and in doctrine begins; and His own Apostles are those who initiate the movement. Is it not more intelligible to hold that the Revelation of God in Christ did reveal something after all-something more than could be gained by the spiritualizing of the law? And, if this be so, the difficulty of regarding definitions of this truth in the Nicene age as final is comparatively slight. In those days men spoke Greek and used philosophical language; and this was not mere noise, it meant something. We have ceased to speak Greek, and are not all familiar with philosophy, but we worship Christ. And, if we mean to retain this practice, and use it rationally, we must express in language the significance we put upon it; we need some definitions. If the Nicene definitions were true, those—translated, transfused with modern life-will be what we need. If theirs were true and ours are true, they will say the same thing; it does not follow, because we no longer talk in terms of Greek philosophy, that it is a matter of indifference, or at least an unessential thing, whether Christ be God or not.

VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

C

n

p

C

rı

ne

m

fo

Va

fre

in

ex

bo

fin

fac

pa

cei

the

ha

ma

UI

wa

Th

As

kin

pro

wai

Kin

wei

nan

Par

pla

ART. VI.—ARISTOTLE ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS.

 Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Edited by F. G. KENYON, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, Assistant in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum. Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1891.

 Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Facsimile of Papyrus CXXXI. in the British Museum. Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1891.

IT is more than seventy years since the *Institutes* of Gaius were discovered in a palimpsest at Verona, and nearly seventy years since Mai deciphered fragments of the De Republica of Cicero from beneath a copy of St. Augustine on the Psalms in the Vatican. Since that time the libraries of Europe and Asia have yielded up no fresh records of classical antiquity. In theology it is different; scarcely a year passes in which the monasteries of the East do not give some fresh document to historians, and unrecognized fragments are still to be found, even in Western libraries. the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did their work well, and the most sanguine student can scarcely hope to recover, among the parchments that have survived, any of the countless lost works of ancient Greece or Rome. Were we still confined to old methods, our knowledge of antiquity would have reached its bound; men would turn away in despair from the constant comparison of wellknown texts and the reiterated discussions of insoluble problems.

That this is not so is the merit of the archæologists. Just when research has almost exhausted the material before it, a new and almost boundless field is disclosed. What the fall of Constantinople did in the fifteenth, the break-up of the Turkish Empire is doing in the nineteenth century. Politics and science have become the servants of history and art. The East is opened up; and scholars to whom the nooks and corners of old libraries offer no more treasures, can disinter and decipher on their native site the very fragments of the civilization they have so long been looking at from afar. The increase of knowledge which some hoped and others feared would stifle the interest that men felt in the

ION

F. G. xford, British of the

nile of ed by

Gaius

eventy Repubon the ries of of clasa year of give I frags. But ries did carcely privived, Rome. dge of Id turn

of well-

soluble

ologists.
I before hat the k-up of century.
Ory and nom the reasures, ery fragoking at ped and t in the

life of the past has given a new vigour and vividness to pursuits which seemed to be decaying. We live in a new renaissance. On the soil of Greece, Asia, and Egypt our archæologists are opening up to us a store of buried records which even in wealth of material promise not to come far short of the discoveries of earlier times. Now, as then, international co-operation and national rivalry make of every change in the political world a gain to learning. The French and the German empires have, each in its turn, tried to recommend themselves by the patronage of art; and if our more diffident Government is less munificent and less imperious, English influence and the private generosity of Englishmen have produced results no less valuable. power of Stratford Canning secured to us the spoils of Halicarnassus, and opened up to Lavard the site of Nineveh: our rule in Egypt may be forgiven by the sternest political opponents if it makes possible a wise examination of Egyptian

monuments, and their careful preservation.

For it is to Egypt, and to Egypt alone, that we now look for the discovery of new literary works. Writings of priceless value we have already received, and still continue to receive. from the soil of Greece. No historical record could exceed in interest the decrees disinterred at Athens, or the earliest extant European code of law discovered in Crete. books there are none. We cannot hope for another happy find like that of the library at Herculaneum. For the ordinary writing material of antiquity was papyrus; the manufacture of this was one of the oldest Egyptian arts; copies of papyrus rolls have been found on monuments of the thirteenth century B.C. It was only with the decay of civilization that the manufacture of it died out. With its use the reed itself has disappeared from Egypt; it is now found only in the marshes near Syracuse, and perhaps in the waters of the Upper Jordan. It was when the art of the papyrus maker was disappearing that the use of parchment became common. The use of prepared leather for writing purposes is as old in Asia as that of the papyrus in Egypt; it is, however, to the kings of Pergamum, especially to Eumenes II., that the proper preparation is due. Pliny tells us that when he wanted to found a great library the jealousy of the Egyptian King prevented the export of papyrus to Asia; the books were therefore written on prepared leather, which received its name of Pergamentum from the city where it was used. Papyrus, however, from its greater cheapness, maintained its place to the end of the second century; in the library of

tl

la

C

th

af

be

to

pa

m

CC

pr

wh

WI

Wa

are

ha lib

SCI

is

ha

Herculaneum, which was destroyed in the year 79, not a single parchment book is found. Its use did not indeed die out entirely till the tenth or eleventh century; from the fourth century, however, parchment has almost completely

replaced it.

The great advantage of parchment is its greater durability. Papyrus is as perishable as paper. It was used over the whole civilized world, but except at Herculaneum and at Ravenna no written manuscripts have been preserved. It is only in the rainless climate of Egypt that the rolls survive the ruins of the libraries for which they were written. In consequence, the earliest classical manuscripts in our libraries date from the lower empire. Egyptian papyri have long been among the commonest of the possessions of our museums; but the first discovered were chiefly in hieroglyphics, and dealt with Egyptian religious matters; what belonged to later times or were in Greek character were private memoranda, the records of a contract or a sale, and contained little of value to archæologists or historians.

It was then a complete surprise to scholars when in 1847 it became known that several fragments, including one roll nearly complete, had been discovered, which comprised some of the speeches of the orator Hyperides, a writer of whose works none had survived. These, with the first edition of which the name of Churchill Babington will always be associated, were eventually acquired for the British Museum, with the other Harris MSS. Since then from time to time other similar discoveries have been made, and especially in the last twenty years the museums of Europe have acquired a large number of Greek papyrus fragments from Egypt. One collection at Vienna is said to contain 15,000 separate pieces. Most of these are unfortunately of very small extent; scattered fragments of a few lines or words, the chance purchase of some lucky traveller from the Arabs, who have picked them up among the tombs. For it is from the tombs that they come. Either the book which he valued had been buried with some dead scholar, or perhaps the papyrus had been used as waste matter in making the mummy case. The chief interest attaching to them is their great antiquity; the fragments of Hyperides were attributed by Sauppe-and he is supported by the late Bishop of Durham-to the second century B.C.; some of the lately discovered fragments of Euripides were probably written less than a century after the death of the author.

In 1878 the Berlin Museum acquired a few fragments of

July

ot a

l die

the

etely

lura-

over

nd at

It is

rvive

aries

long

our

iero-

what

were

sale,

1847

roll

some

vhose

on of

In

some Greek historian; they were at first supposed to be parts of Theopompus, but Bergk eventually was able to show that they belonged to the Constitution of Athens, attributed to Aristotle. There have been preserved to us three catalogues of works of Aristotle; in each of them is mentioned a collection of 157 Constitutions. This work was well known and much used, more so perhaps than any of the other Aristotelian writings. Quotations from it are very frequent, especially in the authors of the early empire, and of it no part is so often referred to as that dealing with the Constitution of Athens. In collections of the fragments of Aristotle nearly 100 are attributed to it alone. It was well known that it was the original source of most of the information concerning the history and government of Athens preserved in late writers; there was no book the loss of which was more to be regretted by historians. It is a nearly complete copy of this which some time ago was found in Egypt; the first edition of it, and the facsimile of the manuscript published by the British Museum, are now before us.

The authorities have wisely given no information as to the place or manner of its discovery. The manuscript itself consists of three or four rolls, of which two are nearly complete, the last being only fragmentary. The papyrus had originally contained the accounts of the steward of a private estate; these are dated for the year 78–9 A.D. The reverse side had afterwards been used for copying out this work of Aristotle, which we are therefore able to date to the end of the first or beginning of the second century after Christ. It is interesting to note that this is not the only work written on the back; part of the papyrus has been already occupied with the argument of the speech of Demosthenes in *Midiam*. It will be convenient to quote Mr. Kenyon's description of the writing:—

'The text is written in four hands. The first is a small semi-cursive hand, employing a large number of abbreviations of common syllables, such as $\tau\eta\nu$, $\tau\eta s$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$. The writing is not that of a professional scribe, but is on the whole very correct and easy to read wherever the papyrus has not been badly rubbed. The second hand is uncial of fair size, written in a plain but not very graceful style, and with habitual mis-spellings and mistakes which show that the writer was not a scholar nor a well-educated person. Many of the mistakes are corrected in the first hand, which suggests that the writer of that hand was a scholar who desired a copy of Aristotle's work for his own library, while the writer of the second was a slave or professional scribe employed by him to complete the transcript. The third hand is semi-cursive, but much larger and more straggling than the first hand. The fourth hand closely resembles the first, and employs

asso-, with other in the red a One sieces. Stent; e purhave tombs I been is had case.

quity;

-and

second

nts of

ter the

nts of

18

in

W

to

ha

ce

cl

ot

" C

nı

be

CU

le

di

se

ìn

ar

th

th

W

th

pl

de

as

do

of

a

W

lit

au

sta

an

bo

an

ar

A

dr

th

ar

many of the same abbreviations, but the strokes are somewhat finer and more upright, and some of the letters are different.'

The first part of the work is in good preservation, but at the beginning some portion is wanting—apparently it had never been copied out, as a space is left clear for it; the first few columns have also been a good deal rubbed. The last part is very much destroyed, and the end is quite fragmentary. The deciphering, owing partly to the age of the writing and partly to the rubbing, was a task requiring great skill and patience. We must congratulate Mr. Kenyon on the success with which he has done this part of the work; having tested it by the facsimile which has been published by the British Museum, we can bear testimony to its accuracy; and after all the criticisms to which it has been subjected and all the emendations which have been proposed, the passages are very few in which his reading of the actual letters of the

manuscript has been disputed.

Apart from the intrinsic value of the work (of which we shall speak presently), it is clear that the discovery of these rolls is an event of the greatest importance. Taken in connection with the number of the smaller fragments of which we have before spoken, it opens out to us a prospect of a great increase to our store of classical literature. It is clear that in the Græco-Roman period there were throughout the whole of Egypt a large number of men who had in their possession copies of Greek works; and there is every reason to hope that this will not be the only one which is preserved. We may expect to recover at least fragments of many of the books which were in popular use at the time. It is indeed not probable that there will be among them any works of great length. These papyri obviously belonged to private individuals; they do not come from the great libraries. We must look for the discovery of such short popular and, we may add, easy books as would be most in demand among. moderately well-educated people; single books of Homer, plays by the more popular dramatists, short poems or collections of poems, and short histories such as this, or extracts and compendiums of larger books, are what we may expect. There is little or no hope that we shall find the greater works of historians such as Theopompus, the complete works of more voluminous poets, or the more difficult works of the philosophers.

For it is a mistake to suppose that manuscripts of older date are likely to contain works of greater value than more modern copies. The reverse is the case. It was not the most

finer

had first last tary. and

ving the and

and ages the

hese conhich of a clear the their ason rved. If the deed

ks of ivate We l, we

mer, ollecracts pect.

orks s of the

nore most important works that had the greatest circulation. A work which has survived the spirit of Christianity, and which men took the trouble to copy out on parchment, must as a rule have had some special value to recommend it. In the tenth century it was only men of great learning who cared to have classical books at all; they would desire to have the best; other people would be content with theology, generally with bad theology. In the first century A.D. or B.C. the number of 'classical' manuscripts would be enormously greater, the number of copies of first-rate works would be proportionately much smaller. The older a manuscript, the less likely it is to be of great value. This is illustrated by the library at Herculaneum already referred to. In this case the complete collection of a Roman gentleman of the first century A.D. was discovered; most of the rolls were ruined by the fire, but a large number could be identified; they consist entirely of second and third-rate Epicurean tracts; not a single one has independent literary worth.

In the case of the Egyptian papyri it is noticeable that among the small number hitherto published there are already three fragments of Hyperides, and that, as said above, before the discovery of this Aristotle small fragments of the same work were in the Berlin Museum. This is probably due to the fact that these works were much used for educational purposes. One of the Hyperides fragments has in fact been declared to be a schoolboy's copy. We would not go so far as to say the same of our Aristotle, but there can be little doubt that the book was much used by schoolmasters, and therefore also by their pupils. This is shown by the character of the authors who quote it. It does not seem to have been a popular book among readers; we should not expect that it would be. With the exception of Plutarch no well-known literary man refers to it; he uses it constantly as one of his authorities for Athenian history; but anyone who was editing or annotating the comic poets or orators would have it constantly by his side; men like Julius Pollux, the grammarians and schoolmasters of the empire, used it in writing their school books and lexicons; it is to them that it owes its celebrity and now its preservation. Its brevity, its simplicity of style, and the name of Aristotle recommended it as a handbook to Athenian history above the more voluminous works of An-

drotion and Philochorus.

These authors always refer to the work as Aristotle's, and though a German scholar has attempted to show that even in antiquity much doubt was felt as to its authenticity, he has

d

tl

tl

t

I

h

not been able to bring any satisfactory evidence against it. It is true that the *Athenian Constitution* is not mentioned by any writer earlier than Plutarch, but one of the other books in the collection of which it was a part is quoted by Polybius, who moreover quotes a criticism on it by Timæus; as Timæus was born before the death of Aristotle, we have very strong evidence that the whole work was known as his, no long time after his death.

Notwithstanding this, many scholars—chief among them being Valentine Rose—have attempted to show that the collections of the Constitutions could not have been by the hand of the great philosopher himself. The arguments by which this position was supported could not but be very vague so long as nothing but short, and often inaccurately quoted, fragments were known. Rose, in fact, contented himself with asserting that, as the Constitutions were clearly a collection of facts in which the history and institutions of each state were narrated without comment or comparison, they could not have been written by Aristotle, whose whole nature was opposed to such unsystematic collections. On the other hand, we know that this kind of work was a favourite pursuit among his pupils. Theophrastus his successor made a collection of this kind, and Cicero had in his library portions of a collection of Laws of various states by Dicæarchus. The Constitutions were then written, he maintained, by some immediate pupil of the philosopher not long after his death.

Statements of this kind, supported on a priori opinion as to what some author is likely to have written, must always be received with caution. It is true that in support of it he appeals to the last paragraph of the Ethics, but this passage can bear exactly the opposite interpretation to that which he puts upon it. It would be difficult to find any justification for the statement, 'Ipse adeo Aristoteles in fine Ethicorum ... clare indicat neque scripsisse adhuc ipsum tales τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν πολιτειῶν συναγωγάs, quales sophistarum studia protulisse ait, nec similis operis edendi consilium cepisse præter politias.' What he really says is that the Sophists do not understand the proper use of collections of laws, and that he, using the collections of Constitutions which he has made (ἐκ τῶν συνηγμένων πολιτειῶν), intends to discuss what is good or bad for a state.

We find, then, that Aristotle refers to a collection of this kind; that one was known and used by the most distinguished historian of his day, certainly within fifty years of Aristotle's

¹ See Rose, Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, p. 396. Leipsic, 1863.

long

ments

erting

cts in

rrated

been

such

v that

oupils.

d, and

rrus of

then

of the

ion as

ays be

it he

assage

ich he

cation

corum

νόμων

studia

præter

do not

nat he,

de (èk

ood or

of this

uished

ist it. death; that it was in every collection of Aristotle's works, ed by before and after the publication of the great edition of books Aristonicus, and that no eminent writer doubts for a moment that it is Aristotle's. There is, in fact, no work of his for which ybius, mæus the external testimony is so strong. We now have before us, in trong a nearly perfect state, the most important part of this work, and time the one most frequently used; we naturally turn to it with interest to inquire what evidence its contents afford on this point. them It will probably be known to most readers that the examination ollechas not been satisfactory to many writers; several distinguished nd of scholars seem inclined to agree with Rose, and to say that h this this book is not by Aristotle, but by one of his scholars.

The particular theory to which in this case scholars seem to incline, is one which it is very difficult to criticize. Scepticism has to be very moderate, for it has been almost conclusively proved that the work was written and finished, almost in the state in which we have it, before the death of Aristotle. There can also be no reasonable doubt that it is Aristotelian to this extent, that it was a product of the school of Aristotle. We are therefore reduced to the alternative, either it was by the philosopher himself, or by some other Peripatetic of the same date, unless we prefer to take a middle way and say it was composed by a pupil under the direction of the master. Each possible variation of these theories finds support, and will probably continue to do so, so long as the work is read. One critic is even able to point out exactly what passages are the additions and corrections of the master, another can show in what parts of the work the pupil depends on the authorities recommended to him by Aristotle, and in what he is trusting to his own independent, though less judicious researches. The same ingenious writer is, however, able to show that Aristotle had something to do with it, for, as he shrewdly points out, we find in it references to facts which Aristotle knew.

The advantage of these theories is that they cannot by any possibility be proved or disproved. It is, of course, possible that Aristotle did not write his book himself but told someone else to do so, and told him how to do it; but it requires very great confidence in one's critical sagacity to assert this. It seems to us that the critical spirit is carried too far. Men often write as if we ought to refuse to believe that a book is by the author to whom it is attributed till its authenticity has been proved. May we suggest that just the opposite rule is the safer? If the external authority for a book is good, we ought to accept it unless it can be proved that it is spurious. It

stotle's 63.

189

tio

inc

be

no

Ce

tri

no

qu

ren

to

the

kn

the

fui

as

to

an

las

be

da

att

wh

Ai

tha

no is

are

arr

pa

ob

15

pa

un

tha

yea

should be remembered that it is always much easier to prove that a spurious work is spurious than that a genuine work is genuine. We ought to look for some palmary evidence; those who deny the authenticity ought to bring something which the reputed author *could* not have written; it is not sufficient to show passages which it is surprising to us that he has written. The required evidence seems to us in this case not yet to have been produced. The cause of the various theories is the attempt to reconcile the undoubted fact of the early date of the work and its reputed Aristotelian authorship with certain peculiarities of style and matter which are different from what is supposed to mark the work of the philosopher himself. These we shall consider presently; but the proof of the early date is so important that we must shortly repeat the arguments on which it depends. They are as follows.

The first part of the work contains an historical account of the various changes which have been made in the Athenian Constitution: this ends with the re-establishment of the democracy in 403. The author, after explaining how this took place, adds: 'The people, having become masters of the situation, established the present Constitution;' and again in his recapitulation of the different forms of government says: 'The eleventh is that which was established after the return of the people from Phyle and the Peiræus, and from then to the present time they have continued adding to the power of the multitude.' Now, in the autumn of 322 B.C., the Macedonians having defeated the allied Greek forces, took Athens, and Antipater became supreme in the city. As the price of peace he ordered a complete change in the Constitution; a high property qualification was introduced, and a large number of the poorer inhabitants departed. With this event, as Grote rightly saw, ends the history of free Greece. It was a revolution more violent in its execution and more disastrous in its circumstances than any which had preceded it. work we have before us could not have been written after it took place; we may almost say, if written before, it could not have been published afterwards without some allusion to it, except on one hypothesis—that the author had died. Aristotle died in August 322, within a year of the death of Alexander, and a few weeks after the death of Demosthenes.

The work was, then, written before the death of Aristotle, but it was composed during his last years. The last date actually mentioned is the Archonship of Cephisophon, which fell in the year 329 B.C. All other notes of time point to the last years of Alexander's lifetime as the period of composi-

ha sta and wh

the

are

we

prove ork is ence; thing is not nat he se not eories early o with ferent opher oof of

at the

July

count enian f the v this of the ain in says: return nen to ver of Macethens, rice of on; a ımber nt, as was a strous The fter it could

died.
ath of henes.
stotle,
t date
which
to the

There is no single statement or reference which is inconsistent with this; there is nothing which could not have been said by a writer of this period, and much which could not have been said at any other time. For instance, as Mr. Cecil Torr has ingeniously pointed out, the author speaks of triremes and of quadriremes in the Athenian fleet, but says nothing of quinqueremes. Inscriptions, however, show that quadriremes were first built shortly before 330 B.C.; quinqueremes are first mentioned in 324, when seven had been added to the fleet. Again, the author speaks of the sacred vessels the Paralos and Ammonias, but does not mention the wellknown Salaminias. Inscriptions tell us that in the year 325 the Salaminias was laid up in the dockyards as unfit for further service. It is supposed that the new name was given as a compliment to Alexander, after he had professed himself to be the son of Ammon. This is doubtful, and has no ancient authority for it; if it is true, it will fix the date to the last year of Alexander's life.

Though there is plenty of corroborative evidence, this will be sufficient to show that there can be no doubt as to the date of the work. These are points on which no forger could attain accuracy. We may here draw attention to a fact which would seem to establish a more direct connexion with Aristotle. The book is not quite finished. We do not mean that it is incomplete, but that the latter part has apparently not received the final revision. The whole of the first division is written with great care; literary effect is aimed at. So too is the beginning of the second division; the first few pages are written in the same style, with every mark of careful arrangement, but towards the end of the work, even in those passages where the text is complete, a great change is to be There are marks of haste and carelessness, there is repetition, the order is at times confused, little attention is paid to style, in the place of finished periods we find an unconnected series of bald and harsh notes. If we remember that the work was certainly not completed much more than a year before Aristotle's death, and that of all his works which have come down to us nearly all are in just such an unfinished state, how natural it is to conclude that his flight from Athens and death are the cause of this!

There are, however, certain characteristics of the book which have made many scholars reluctant to believe that it is the actual work of Aristotle. Both in style and matter there are some peculiarities which at first sight cause surprise, and we undoubtedly miss some of the best known peculiarities of

420

189

of

the

phi

the

wh

oft

of

his

cop

and

wh

am

tru

gua

sti

the

it

an

gre

CO

Aı

to

ou

ba

de

his

th

nu

sty

fei

tic

m

th

hu

an

fir

pl

ce

th

m

W

his other writings. One argument is based on the vocabulary: a considerable number of words occur which are not to be found in Aristotle's other works. Others have tried to show that the use of prepositions and particles is different from that to which we are accustomed. There has not yet been time thoroughly to weigh and sift this evidence; it is, however, clear that much of it goes too far. Of the un-Aristotelian words many are completely new, others were hitherto not known to exist before the Roman period; many again are technical terms which could not but be used in a book on Athenian history; what remain are not so numerous as to be inconsistent with Aristotelian authorship. Again, no writer has such well-marked mannerisms of style as Aristotle; we miss his well-known terms of expression, his parentheses, his $a\pi o\rho (a)$, his forcible epigrammatic thoughts; we are surprised to find in place of the short, pregnant, rugged, unformed sentences of the Ethics, a well-balanced period, with an easy flow of narrative in which all harsh collision of vowels is carefully avoided; a style which is perhaps not very lively, but above all correct; a style perhaps even too colourless and regular, but nevertheless admirably adapted to its purpose in a popular handbook.

If we possessed nothing of Aristotle's but the Ethics we should then feel much difficulty in believing that the two works were by the same author. Fortunately this is not the case, and in the great mass of Aristotelian works which have come down to us it is very easy to find much which is not very dissimilar in style to this new work. It is a mistake to talk about Aristotle's style: he has several. There are many passages in the Politics, in the Metaphysics, and in the works on natural history which show, though to a less extent, all the phenomena of this new book. We find a clear distinction between what we may call the argumentative and the narrative styles. Opinions may vary as to the exact degree of difference; it is at least sufficient to justify us in expecting that if Aristotle did write a popular handbook to Athenian history it would not be unlike this one. It must not, however, be supposed that this is entirely without notes of Aristotelian authorship; though they are not very common, there are a considerable number of his favourite words and expressions, and here and there even more minute resemblances of language. There is, moreover, another characteristic to which sufficient attention has not been drawn—the great accuracy of expression; though the author has not forgotten to appeal to the ear, he has never allowed this to interfere with precision

XUM

July
ulary;
to be
show
the from
the been
the howtelian
to not
in are
took on
the as to

writer
e; we
es, his
prised
ormed
n easy
vels is
lively,

ss and

tics we the two oot the in have is not take to many works int, all inction marragree of

e are a essions, of lanwhich curacy appeal ecision

ecting

henian

wever,

otelian

of language. In this respect the contrast with the works of the school of Isocrates is very marked; the writing comes from some one who has enjoyed the scientific education of a philosopher, not the purely literary one of a rhetorician.

This question of style is of peculiar interest, because of the valuable illustration it gives to an old difficulty. We who know Aristotle by his purely philosophical works have often been surprised by the language which the ancients use Cicero often praises the suavitas and brevitas of his style; he speaks of it as marked dicendi incredibili cum copia tum etiam suavitate, and tells us even of the ornamenta and the flumen aureum orationis. Quintilian does not know whether he is distinguished most for his learning, the amount he has written, or his suavitas eloquendi. Now, it is true that we can scarcely say that a golden flow of language, or rhetorical ornament, is a characteristic of the Constitution of Athens, but we could in no way better describe the style than by saying it combines suavitas with brevitas; it does unite ease and lucidity with a great power of concise and accurate expression. If, then, we reject this work on the ground of style, we must be prepared, if they are ever discovered, to reject with it all the other more popular works of Aristotle which Cicero knew. In that case we are committed to the opinion that the works comprised in what Grote calls our Aristotle are his only genuine writings, and most probably to the corollary that for three hundred years after the death of the philosopher nearly all the works circulated as his were spurious. How much more probable is it to suppose that during his own lifetime Aristotle published a large number of works, many of them popular both in matter and That these showed much of his master's felicity and fertility of language, and had in consequence a large circulation; that when he became older, probably at the commencement of his last sojourn at Athens, he set to work to compose that vast series of systematic treatises on all subjects of human knowledge in which he was interrupted by his flight and death. When this took place, the greater part was not finished, and little or nothing had been published. Of most of the works he left a mass of notes in every degree of completion. The care of his papers was the duty of his successor and his son. They at once gave to the world such of his works as were ready for publication, including probably this new book. The editing of the rest occupied them for many years, and they never finished the work; so that when the library of Theophrastus was brought to Athens in

th

co

W

sh

ou

m

th

in

T

ac

hi

al

O

d

li

th

a

the time of Sulla, Aristonicus found the materials for what was really the first complete edition of his philosophical works. The *suavitas* of this work will be accounted for by the fact that it was almost finished at his death, and is not a collection of notes edited by his pupil; partly, no doubt, also by the nature of the subject. That it has not the wealth of language of which Cicero speaks is doubtless due to the fact that it was written in the last period of his life, when the influence of Plato was dying out and he was chiefly occupied with strictly scientific studies. In the fact that the excellence of style is not kept up throughout we see a universal characteristic of all the works of this later period, and one the cause of which is easily recognized.

We must now turn to the contents of the work, and consider what the value of it is as an historical record, and whether the treatment of the subject throws any light on the question of authorship. The discovery of this work is peculiarly opportune. The study of the internal history of Athens has in the last few years been pursued, especially in Germany, with much vigour; scholars have been occupied in assimilating the great mass of fresh knowledge afforded by inscriptions. The result has been, on the one hand, a great increase in our knowledge; on the other, a very clear perception of the limitations of it. On all sides problems of the greatest interest presented themselves, to which no answer seemed forthcoming. In the midst of this discussion there suddenly appears a history of the Constitution of Athens; its reputed author was the man of all others best able to help us in our difficulties. The greatest savant of antiquity, he had brought an eye exercised by a singularly encyclopædic education to the observation of political phenomena. As a philosopher his judgment had been trained under the greatest of thinkers. A foreigner, he could look with impartiality on the most bitter party questions, and weigh without prejudice the full merit of the achievements of Athens; the best part of his early life had been spent there, and fifteen years of his maturest manhood. As the recognized head of learning, he had a position which put him on an equality with the greatest political leaders. He was a man of great private means, and his position in the greater world of Greece was as distinguished as that at Athens. The tutor of Alexander and friend of Antipater, he held the key to the politics of the present to the same extent that, as the pupil of Plato, he had inherited from him and Socrates the best traditions of the great school of Athenian political thinkers.

what shical or by s not oubt, t the s due s life, was e fact at we

Tulv

later conand it on rk is ry of ly in upied orded nd, a clear olems h no ssion n of best nt of ılarly henoained look

ts of there, ecogm on was a reater The e key s the e best ters.

weigh

It was natural that the expectations aroused should be great; it was inevitable that they should be disappointed. Not because the work is not valuable—that it is, but because it is not novel: that it could not be. This work had been the source of so much that we knew even before its discovery, that it need be no surprise if the most serious gaps in our knowledge coincide with subjects not dealt with by it. To all complaints that we are not told this or that which we should like to know, it will be sufficient to answer that, if what we desiderate had been narrated by Aristotle, we should have known it long ago. It would be fairer to point out the unique value of this work, which is shown by the fact that where it fails we have to be satisfied with the most fragmentary and uncertain knowledge. We may regret that Aristotle has not told us more, but we ought to be grateful that he has told us so much.

Not, however, that the discovery of this work is without importance. Nothing could be further from the truth. The actual additional facts of which it tells us are considerable. To select a few: we have for the first time a reasonable account of the early history of the Archonship, and one which opens up many interesting analogies with the early history of other states; we have for the first time details about the constitutional struggles after the time of Solon. The accounts of Cleisthenes and Aristeides add considerably to our knowledge. Again, about the method of elections and the duties of the magistrates we learn much that is new; fresh light is thrown upon a most difficult subject, the position of the demes in the Athenian state; we are told for the first time authoritatively the rules which determined how often a manmight serve on the Council of Five Hundred, a matter on which we had before no information, and one of prime importance to our understanding of the Constitution.

It is not, however, the addition to our knowledge that is most important, but the simplification of it. The work is none the less valuable that much of what it tells us serves only to confirm theories long held, or to settle disputes on minor points. The metaphor of an enthusiastic German is not inapt: 'It is the sunlight which scatters the thousand historical hypotheses like bats.' If there is little which was not within the range of knowledge or conjecture of a specialist, there is much which for the first time is made available to ordinary students. Our knowledge formerly depended on the comparison of obscure texts from scholiasts and lexicographers; before the simplest point could be established their

18

at

ta

CO

ha

us

T

al

wh

of

A

bo

th

de

de

ar

on

me

tiv

wh

att

pro

eas

it;

cir

ori

ab

the

wa

bee

giv

ade

the

the

often inconsistent accounts had to be weighed against one another, and the origin of the statement discovered; the discussion was not attractive and was often of necessity inconclusive; it occupied the time of historians and frightened readers from a most interesting subject; a large mass of ascertained truths did not have the full effect it deserved. Most of this obscurity will now be cleared away; and it will be of no small value if a whole side of Greek life which has hitherto been too much ignored is brought before all classical

students and even the general reader.

the earlier period.

Of course, for every question which is solved another will be raised; but the change will be pure gain. The whole discussion will have advanced a stage. Before, we had to depend on second-hand authorities of the early empire; now we can deal with first-hand authorities of the fourth century B.C. Instead of comparing Harpocration, Photius, and Suidas, we shall be able to discuss the views of Aristotle, Androtion, and Philochorus. The discovery of this one work gives us a key to the whole literature of the period; we know what statements are to be ascribed to Aristotle, we can from this make out much of the relations of the historians to one another, and even the nature of the authorities they used for

It was a time of great literary activity; the emulation of the two great schools of Isocrates and Plato produced an extraordinary number of orators, rhetoricians, and historians. One of the favourite subjects for the historians was the history of Athens. Later writers use a special word, 'Atthis,' for these works, and the authors are commonly known as the Atthidographi. It is clear from the fragments that we possess of these writers that there was a close connexion between some of them and Aristotle; the narrative is often similar, at times given in identical words. A comparison of this new work with the lives of Plutarch and the histories of Diodorus Siculus shows that these later writers had access to the same authorities that Aristotle used, so that his shorter account is illustrated and explained by their more voluminous extracts. Who were these authorities, and what was their value? These are the questions which will now occupy historians. Some writers have expressed surprise at the close resemblance; they object to the use made of his authorities by the author, and argue even that it is the sign of an uncritical writer, who could not have been Aristotle. As more than half the work is occupied with the narrative of events which happened before Aristotle was born, it is difficult to see how he could avoid using uly

one

lis-

on-

ned

of

red.

will

has

ical

will

dis-

end

can

B.C.

we

ion,

is a

hat

this

one

for

n of

an

ans.

tory

for

the

sess

veen

r, at

new

orus

ame

nt is

acts.

lue?

ians.

nce;

thor,

who

rk is

efore

ising

other books; it is still more difficult to see why he should attempt to do so. If his narrative is, as is often the case, taken nearly verbatim from some other writer, there is no reason to suppose that he has not fully considered the trustworthiness of the account he uses. These authorities were doubtless in many cases contemporary, or nearly so, with the events that they describe; some of them certainly were. Of course, if Aristotle had written a full Constitutional History of Athens based entirely on original documents, as he could have done, had he wished it, it would have been much more useful to us; but that is not what he professes to do. That it was a constitutional history at all gave it a value all its own. We perhaps, in these days, hardly realize what a step it was in historical method to write a book There were plenty of historians of Attica; of this kind. Aristotle did not desire to add to them. They were, as we can see from their remains, usually very voluminous; about five books were generally occupied with the legendary history; the stories of gods and heroes, which formed the staple of historians from the days of Hecatæus, were narrated in full detail. These Aristotle passes by without a word; he excludes, moreover, all that was not essential to constitutional development. Hence the battles of Salamis and Marathon are only referred to as fixing a date. To show the great superiority of his conception and treatment of history not only to that of almost all ancient historians but of most modern ones, it is only necessary to compare his account of the development of the Archonship with the popular narratives of the same thing. If we keep before our minds that what Aristotle wished was not to tell new facts, but to draw attention to certain well-known events and put them in their proper light, explaining their historical importance, we can easily understand his use of his authorities. The popular story was in its way true; where it is misleading he corrects it; he warns his readers to reject many of the foolish stories circulated; where it is deficient he supplements it by giving original authorities; as a rule he is content to repeat it and abbreviate it. His method is shown well in the account of the aristocratic revolutions at the end of the Peloponnesian war. There were very many accounts of them; they had been described by eye-witnesses and actors; he therefore gives little or no account of the more striking events, but adds full quotations from original documents which explain the constitutional points at issue, and show the motives and theories by which the reformers were influenced, and inci-VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

XUM

dentally corrects a false impression on some constitutional matters which would be caused by Xenophon's narrative of the same events.

It seems to us, in fact, that the plan of the work shows as much as anything we possess of his the great superiority of It consists of two parts: the first a Aristotle's intellect. narrative of the development of the Constitution down to the year 403; the second an account of it at the time when the work was written. Some writers have expressed surprise that the narrative is so simple; the author has not attempted to compare the Constitution with others. To us that appears a singular merit. The book was written avowedly as an introduction and companion to the Politics; in the Politics we possess to some extent the comparison of different states; were the book completed we should have it more fully. But, as he tells us at the end of the Ethics and in the Politics (and it is a lesson most of his critics and most contemporary politicians still have to learn), the comparative study of politics must be founded on an acquaintance with the historical development of each state; it is no use making collections of isolated laws taken from different and dissimilar constitutions. Each state is a whole with a life of its own; this must be carefully studied before any comparison with other states can be made. In order to help such a study he wrote his collections of Constitutions. To have incorporated the comparisons in the account of each would have been useless: he would have been repeating what he meant to say at length in the Politics. It has been supposed that difference of treatment is a sign that the work is spurious; we consider it a sign that it is genuine. Aristotle valued his time too much to write two books saying the same thing.

As a test of authenticity the relation to the *Politics* is of great importance. If it is possible to point out serious historical discrepancies between the two, or if the authors hold different opinions on political questions, we shall undoubtedly have to acknowledge that the required evidence of spuriousness is forthcoming. The discrepancies that have so far been brought forward are not serious; the most important is the direct contradiction between the account of Draco in the *Politics* and that given in this new work. They cannot well have been written by the same author; in drawing any conclusions from this we must, however, remember that the passage in the *Politics* is one that has been long suspected by critics, and the passage in the *Constitution* is one which for other reasons is not improbably a later addition. Apart from this

a

li

a

lo

CE

th

fre

in

no

TI

ine

ional re of

July

vs as
ty of
rst a
o the
that
ed to
pears
n inics we
tates;
But,

s (and politics deveons of ations. ust be es can collecarisons would in the

n that

o write

s is of
serious
authors
all unence of
have so
portant
raco in
cannot
ng any
hat the
ected by
or other

om this

one passage the two works agree thoroughly; the writer shows the same attitude towards the democracy that Aristotle does; like him, he distrusts and dislikes it; he displays the philosopher's superiority to it which is so characteristic of all the Socratic school; like them, he sees the great Athenian statesmen in Solon, Nicias, and Theramenes; like them, he supports the moderate aristocratic party against the strong democrats and the violent reactionaries. His attitude towards the democracy is, however, never bigoted; he recognizes its merits, he does not grudge it praise, and his ideal state would include large democratic elements. There is no reason to see in this the effect of the popular excitement at the time of the death of Alexander. This appreciation of the merits of both democracy and aristocracy, which causes him to aim at uniting in his polity the advantages of both, is one of the strongest characteristics of Aristotle's method; he desires in politics as elsewhere to assimilate in his philosophy all that is good in the more one-sided opinions of other thinkers. truth, as he often reminds us, must include all the half-truths which are the cause of so much error. His distrust of extreme democracy does not prevent him from doing full justice to the many elements of good government which are the peculiar advantage of a generous distribution of political power.

We consider that this work, though different in plan, shows substantial agreement with the *Politics*, and that the design and conception is thoroughly characteristic of the powerful intellect of Aristotle. There was probably no other man living at the time to whom this could be due: the author is as much superior in his conception of historical science to his contemporaries and his successors, as Aristotle was in his logical and scientific work. We are justified in putting him in the first class of Greek historians with Thucydides and Polybius; immensely inferior as he is to the former in literary

ability, it is with them that he must be classed.

Excellence of plan is, however, not incompatible with a certain imperfection of execution. It is a question how far this work must be accepted as an authority where it differs from other received accounts. The question arises concerning a limited number of passages which contain matter so novel as to be almost incredible. The most serious are the accounts of the Draconian Constitution and the *ruse* by which Themistocles helped in the overthrow of Areopagus. The first of these cannot be accepted as a true account, for it is inconsistent with all we know about the early history of Athens, and is inconsistent with much in this work itself.

The second causes an insuperable confusion in chronology. The chronology of the work is in fact a very serious difficulty. The author has taken great trouble with it: he has carefully dated every event, but in many cases the dates given are most surprising; it appears, for instance, as if the battle of Marathon is placed in the year 491 or 492, instead of 490. Some of these difficulties may possibly be due to a textual corruption, and in the case of the two most serious we are inclined to believe that they are later insertions; not because of their historical inaccuracy alone, but because one is never quoted by any ancient writer, and the other only by one. This could scarcely happen had they been found in all texts. In a few other passages we are inclined to suppose that there is a serious lacuna. It is still too soon to express a decided opinion on the more complicated questions of chronology. It must, however, be remembered that faultlessness is not a characteristic of any of Aristotle's writings; superior as he was to other writers in his historical feeling, it is still possible to point out in the Politics places in which he seems to have gone astray.

It is noticeable that the difficulties are confined entirely to the first part. The second statistical description of the State is, so far as we can test it by inscriptions, singularly accurate. A good deal of it is sketchy, and there is at times some confusion in the arrangement; but this seems, as we have already said, to be due to haste and want of completion. Making allowance for these shortcomings in both parts, it still remains true that this is not only by far the most valuable work on Athens that we possess, but that with the exception of the first twenty chapters of Thucydides, there is no ancient history which contains in this short compass such an admirable survey of a prolonged and difficult subject; whether it is, as we believe, a work of Aristotle himself, or only due to his influence, it shows the extraordinary power which he had of seeing and distinguishing what was important, and how far above any writer for the next two thousand years, he was in his understanding of the right

method of approaching historical questions.

In conclusion, we must say a few words about the edition published by the British Museum. Of the palæographical work we have already spoken; and the admirable facsimile, though we believe rather more difficult to read than the original, is of great value to scholars. Mr. Kenyon's edition we have found of very great service. He has boldly, and we think rightly, instead of simply attempting to issue a correct

0

11

at

July

ogy.

ulty.

fully

le of

490.

ctual

are

ause

ever

one.

exts.

there

cided

logy.

not a

as he

ssible

have

ely to

State

urate.

some

have

etion.

rts, it most th the nere is

s such bject;

self, or

power

as im-

t two

edition

aphical

csimile,

he ori-

ion we

and we

correct

text, added full illustrations and comment. The best praise for his work is, that it has been found by all, what it is intended to be, a very useful help to farther illustration. It is, we think, to be regretted that the sheets before publication were not read over by some practised critic: a certain number of blunders, which, though of no serious importance, are undoubtedly a blemish on the text, would then have been easily removed. The conditions which prevented this may possibly have been imposed by the authorities of the Museum. The triple work of describing the original manuscript, settling the text, and writing historical notes is more than could be satisfactorily done by one man. Much credit is due to Mr. Kenyon for having achieved so much. A certain laxity in the use of prepositions and a few grammatical slips will gladly be pardoned by all who have profited by the great trouble he has taken to prepare the way for discussion of more important matters. The only point on which we are disposed to seriously disagree with him is, that he has not separated the critical from the epexegetical notes, so that it is often easy to overlook the fact that the text as printed is not the reading of the manuscript. This is a serious fault. A few of the historical notes and the parallels adduced from general history are not, it seems to us, very much to the point; and the introduction is perhaps rather too popular. These defects, however, are far outweighed by the real excellence of most of the work.

ART. VII.—THE COLONIAL EPISCOPATE.

 Jubilee Report of the Council for Colonial Bishoprics. (London, 1891.)

2. Some Account of the Legal Development of the Colonial Episcopate. By Lord BLACHFORD. (London, 1883.)

AMID the many signs of revived Church life for which our branch of the great Catholic Church has to be thankful, not one is more remarkable than that to which the report named at the head of this article bears witness. Slowly, step by step, the Church of England seems to have learned her duties and responsibilities, and undertaken to discharge them. For a time the shock necessarily produced by such a revolution as the Reformation compelled her earnest sons to concentrate their thoughts and efforts upon maintaining their posi-

tion and defending their creed; they had to resist the wild extravagancies of some who were eager to push forward and change or destroy whatever they found existing, and who could not distinguish between accretions or distortions of religious truth and what appertained to the Catholic faith. Then, immediately following upon this, came the Great Rebellion, with the temporary overthrow of the visible existence of the Church in the land, and there succeeded soon after the Revolution which deprived the Church of the services of some of her more earnest sons, and gave to the State an authority in the management of her affairs to which it was not entitled, owing to the subserviency of many of those who filled her highest offices, and their failing to oppose the silencing the voice of her Convocations, by which her

freedom might have been upheld.

It was during this dreary season that her American colonies expanded. For a time the spiritual needs of the colonists, who were attached to the Church, were ignored by the home authorities, but, with a great increase in their numbers, it came to be realized by a few earnest people that something must be done for them. A first effort caused a few Anglican clergymen to be scattered somewhat sparsely throughout the region that now constitutes the United States of America. This effort was made by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that had been founded in 1701, with the special object of ministering to our colonists. good men who founded that society did what they could, but that fell very short of what was needed to plant the Church. It is difficult to realize the position of disadvantage at which an Episcopal Church without Bishops was placed in America, for there could be no efficient oversight, no possibility of children and others being confirmed, no power to obtain indigenous clergymen to minister to their compatriots without their undertaking a long, tedious, costly, and somewhat dangerous voyage of many thousands of miles to obtain ordination. No wonder that the sects multiplied, and that only a remnant continued faithful to the Church of their baptism; the only cause for surprise is that the Church existed at all. The faithful in America appealed to the home authorities for the remedy of these evils; they asked that Bishops might be sent out. But the Anglican Bishops were timid; they feared to venture upon consecrating Bishops for the service of the Church in America without the authorization of the Government; and the Prime Minister, when asked for such authorization, is reported to have said of the sup-

XUM

ar m S fc w tr

18

se th ou ar ou N we

de ho sic corregatt mi epi

aut and of to pre Chi

civi

thi

of the spin effo the amo and In

slav

uly

rild

and

vho

of

ith.

eat

ist-

oon

the

the

nich

y of

ose

her

nies

ists,

ome

s, it

ning

ican

the

rica.

n of

701,

The

, but

urch.

hich

erica,

ty of

n in-

thout

what

btain

that

their

nurch

home

that

were

os for

oriza-

asked

sup-

plicants for the religious ministrations that Bishops alone can

supply, 'D- their souls; let them grow tobacco.'

It was not until after the States had thrown off the authority of England that Bishops were consecrated to minister to those who longed for their help. At first by the Scotch Bishops, and subsequently by English Bishops, the foundations were laid of that Episcopal Church in America which has grown rapidly in these latter years, and which, we trust, at no distant time will completely overshadow the land. The ice once broken, authority having been obtained to consecrate some Bishops to minister out of England, a sense of the political loss sustained by the alienation of the people in our colonies from the communion of the Church having been aroused, a feeble beginning was made by providing Bishops for our North American colonies. A Bishop was consecrated for Nova Scotia in 1787, and one for Quebec in 1793; and these were all that were set aside for the oversight of our colonies and foreign possessions up to the close of the last century. India, with its teeming millions of heathen, and considerable population of Europeans engaged in governing and holding the country, was jealously guarded against the intrusion of Bishops, who might lead the natives to fear that their conquerors were anxious for their conversion. The vast regions of Australia, that were rising into notice and slowly attracting colonists from our shores, were left with a few missionary clergymen to minister to them, but without any episcopal oversight. A movement was made towards removing this evil in 1814, when an Act of Parliament was passed authorizing the erection of Calcutta into an Episcopal See, and providing an income for its occupant out of the revenues of the country. In 1835, by a similar authority, Madras was to have its own Bishop, and in 1837 Bombay, so that each presidency had a Bishop to preside over the affairs of the Church, and to look after the chaplains sent out by the rulers of the country for the spiritual benefit of the soldiers and civilians in their service. The agitation about the freedom of the slaves in the West Indies drew special attention to the condition of that part of the world, and to the moral and spiritual state of those unhappy people, in whose behalf great efforts were being made. It was, therefore, to be expected that the legislature of these islands would be glad to see Bishops amongst them, who might minister to their spiritual wants, and supply what was needed for the efficiency of the Church. In 1824, nine years before the Act for the freedom of the slaves passed the Imperial Legislature, Jamaica and Barbadoes

18

sti

m

CC

wl

re

fo

Bi

be

to

wh

th

lec

un

rei

of

hil

ba

WC

ch

mo

an

wh

wh

tos

no

wh

on

the

were formed into dioceses, and provision for the support of the Bishops was made by the local legislatures. Some years later, in 1836, Australia, which had been regarded as part of the diocese of Calcutta since it had become a British settlement, and had been presided over by an archdeacon, was blessed with a Bishop. The only other dioceses founded before the great movement was set on foot, to which we are about to call attention, were Toronto and Newfoundland. Hitherto all that had been done to make provision for the proper superintendence and permanence of the Anglican communion, in the various possessions of the Crown, had been undertaken in connexion with the State authorities, and in reliance upon suitable provision being made for the Bishops to be appointed out of State resources. How insufficient and unreliable such assistance proved itself to be has been shown by the small number of dioceses that had been created, and by the difficulties which had to be encountered in order to accomplish the little that had been done.

In 1841 a new state of things was to commence, and April 27 of that year is a day to be marked in the annals of the Anglican communion with a white stone. Moved by the statements and request of Bishop Blomfield and the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, secretary of the S.P.G., the Archbishop of Canterbury (Howley) issued the following invitation to the clergy and laity of the land:—

'The Archbishop of Canterbury, looking to the defective provision hitherto made for planting the Church in the distant dependencies of the British Empire, and desiring that an effort should be made to extend to them the full benefit of its apostolical government and discipline, invites the clergy and laity to attend a meeting at Willis's Rooms, King Street, St. James's, on Tuesday, April 27, 1841, for the purpose of commencing a fund for the endowment of additional Bishoprics in the colonies.'

This invitation was enthusiastically responded to. The rooms were crowded with a distinguished assembly of ecclesiastics and laymen. The Archbishop of Canterbury took the chair, and in his opening speech pointed out the special difficulties and hindrances to the growth of the spiritual life of the colonists, and then added—

'One of the causes why our holy religion has not prospered so much as might have been expected is that these things were not thought of at the first establishment of the colonies. We did not follow the example of the French, who, when they settled their colonists in the New World, sent out with them Bishops, with an efficient staff attached to them, and their religious establishments are

July

rt of

rears

part

itish

con,

nded

e are

land.

oper

nion,

aken upon

inted

such

mall

diffiplish

and

ls of

y the

Rev.

op of

o the

pro-

epen-

ıld be

nment

ing at

1841, addi-

The

eccle-

took

pecial

al life

red so

re not

id not

their

its are

still flourishing. We sent out our countrymen with only a few clergymen; and the natural consequence was the increase of dissent and the decline of religion in these colonies. The mistake was perceived after the termination of the contest with America. That extensive country was lost to us, and our statesmen at that time showed what they considered as one of the causes of that loss, by the measures which they afterwards took to establish Bishoprics in the provinces which still remained to the Empire—Canada and Nova Scotia. The remedy was applied late; it has notwithstanding had great effect.'

The Bishop of London (Blomfield) pressed home the need for the proposed work by saying—

'I have elsewhere remarked, that an episcopal Church without a Bishop is neither more nor less than a contradiction in terms; and the Church ceases effectively to have a Bishop when it is removed beyond his possible superintendence or ministration. This ought not to be the case with any portion of Christ's Church, with any department of His vineyard. It was not the case with any of those Churches which were founded by the Apostles and apostolic men; it was not the case for many ages afterwards, during which it was an acknowledged maxim of the Christian world, "Ecclesia est in Episcopo" (the outward being and constitution of a Church consists in its having a Bishop). It was not the case in any one of the provinces of Christ's universal Church till the example was unhappily set by our own reformed branch of that Church.'

Archdeacon Manning urged the same duty by a different argument :—

'Surely, as citizens, the only hope we can have for the perpetuity of this great Christian Empire is that its basis shall be upon the holy hills; that its unity of organization shall be identified with the unity and organization of the Church of Christ, and so be made partaker of her perpetuity. If we look back, as every Christian man will look back, to the history of past empires—not regarding the history of the world as a turbulent rolling sea, in which empires rise and fall by chance, driven about by some blind destiny, but recognizing some moral law, guided by an unerring Governor, determining the rise and fall of empires, as of men-if we look at Rome of old, and see how she was, as it were, the beast of burden, to carry the light of which she herself did not partake; how for three centuries she laid the whole earth open, and always traversable, and brought all nations together, and was herself the centre of them all, and yet she partook not of that Christianity which she unconsciously assisted to propagate: when we see too how Constantinople, afterwards full of commerce and Christianity and philosophy, and all the splendid arts of life, has sunk into a degraded Mahomedan Power, and how the Cross, which once gleamed upon her, has waned into the crescent; and how Spain, the greatest colonial empire that the world ever saw, except our own, from the time when she set herself to quench in blood the pure

light of Christ's Gospel, how she has likewise declined in these latter days to come to nought, and is herself preying upon herself—when we behold these things, and see that it has pleased the providence of the same Supreme Governor to raise us up now to stand where they stood, and to commit to us the same deposit, to make us the carriers of the light, we surely have the choice to make whether we will be the mere beast of burden for all nations or the evangelist of the world.'

The result of the meeting was to kindle a large amount of enthusiasm, and to draw forth an unusually liberal response for carrying out the great object proposed. In the words of the *Jubilee Report*—

'From the date of its institution the council of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund have been entrusted with the administration of nearly 800,000/,, and have also been the means of eliciting large gifts of land for the endowment of Sees' (p. 4).

And whereas

'in 1841 there were only ten Bishoprics in foreign parts, all supported by imperial or local funds, which in seven cases out of ten have since been withdrawn, there are now eighty-two dioceses, administered by eighty-two Bishops, of whom four are coadjutors of Fredericton, Antigua, Jamaica, and Brisbane respectively; in four instances a Bishop presides over two dioceses, viz. Saskatchewan and Calgary, Barbadoes and the Windward Islands, Singapore and Sarawak, and Mackenzie River and Selkirk. The eighty-two dioceses are thus distributed: one in Europe, sixteen in Asia, fourteen in Africa, twenty-one in North America, nine in the West Indies and South America, thirteen in Australia, and eight in New Zealand and the Pacific. Of these sixty-one are grouped in seven provinces, the others being suffragans of the See of Canterbury. Of the whole number there are fourteen Sees without endowment, the Bishops being for the time supported by missionary societies in England; three are supported partly by endowment and partly by missionary societies; of the remainder seven are still maintained by public funds, in some cases limited to the lives of the present Bishops, and three are maintained partly by endowment and partly by public funds' (pp. 3 and 4).

It would be difficult to find a more remarkable example of success—difficult to find any effort to further the work of the Church which has been more signally blessed. And this success is the more noteworthy if we take into account what the writer of the *Jubilee Report* says:—

'Since the foundation of the fund only two public meetings have been held on its behalf, viz. in 1853 and 1874; it has refrained from making general and widespread appeals for money; it may be add expe (p. ;

it n

thei

189

bee proportion of the and rest ceed point epis has tion at the in o

of or her Lord the of le men pane the le to qu' befor

the

auth

gover lated he ap so-ca riage the c eccle appea only be br

Whe of the

(p. 3)

July

itter

hen

e of

riers

ll be

the

ount

re-

the

onial

early

fts of

sup-

, ad-

rs of

four

ewan

and

ceses

en in

and

s, the

whole being

e are

eties;

some

main-

(pp.

mple

ork of

d this

what

s have

rained

nay be

added that it has been worked at the very minimum of cost, all its expenditure of this sort being less than 11. per cent. of its receipts' (p. 3).

Truly of this expansion of our Church's power and influence

it may be said, 'This hath God done.'

In this remarkable growth of the Anglican communion there is great cause for thankfulness; but the growth has not been confined to the number of Sees founded, endowments provided, and colonies blessed with the complete ministrations of the Church. Together with these advances there has been a corresponding growth and improvement in the acceptance and understanding of the foundations on which the Church rests, and of the principle on which this growth ought to proceed. Rightly to estimate this, it may be well to examine the points of view from which an enlargement of the Colonial episcopate has been regarded, and the great change which has taken place in Church opinion respecting the State's relation to the Church. It was necessary briefly to mention this at the outset; we now propose to consider it more at length, in order to set forth the great debt of gratitude we owe to the Colonial Bishoprics Fund. We, fortunately, have high authority to which to refer for a description of this growth of opinion and development of the Church's appreciation of her true position with respect to the colonial episcopate. Lord Blachford was for some years permanent secretary at the Colonial Office. In 1883 he wrote a statement in a series of letters to the Guardian newspaper on the 'Legal Development of the Colonial Episcopate,' which he afterwards expanded and published as a pamphlet, which we have named at the head of this article. It is from this pamphlet we propose to quote. It tells us that

before the establishment of any Bishopric in the colonies the governor was spoken of as "ordinary," and in that capacity he collated to benefices (where, as in the West Indies, such things existed), he appointed and dismissed Government chaplains, and he exercised so-called ecclesiastical jurisdiction respecting the granting of marriage licenses and probate of wills. A certain disciplinary relation to the clergy was supposed to exist in the Bishop of London, and, as the ecclesiastical law of England does not extend to the colonies, it appears to have been thought decent that certain moral offences, only cognisable in England by that law, should by local enactments be brought under the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of justice (p. 3).

When such had been the relation between the representatives of the Crown and the colonial clergy before the foundation 436

of a Bishopric, it can be no matter for surprise that when in 1787 a Bishop was appointed for Nova Scotia, for whom an income was to be provided out of public funds, the letters patent authorizing the establishment of the See should be of a most Erastian character, and that they should contain this clause:—

'We do, by these presents, give to the said Charles Inglis and his successors' (being, of course, first duly consecrated) 'full power and authority to confer the orders of deacon and priest, to confirm those that are baptized and come to years of discretion, and to perform all other functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of a Bishop' (p. 6).

In 1793 the See of Quebec was founded upon very similar lines. In both cases

'the notion evidently prevailing in high quarters was to reproduce as far as possible in the colony the English State hierarchy—to weld together by the exercise of the royal prerogative an Imperial Church Establishment—a pervading "Church of England" bound by ties of interest and loyalty to support the Throne, from which its authority was derived. On some such view the same law officers' (who had drawn up the letters patent) 'were desired to report whether the Sovereign could give the new Bishop an ex officio place in the Legislative Council—analogous to the seats of the English Bishops in the House of Lords. They reported that this would not be lawful, but that each Bishop might on his appointment be summoned to the Council permanently and by name. And this, I believe, for a long time was done.'

It is clear that the object in founding these Sees was more immediately political than religious. As in the case of the Test and Corporation Act at home the Church was used as the State's instrument for securing what was thought to be essential for the temporal well-being of the country, so the introduction of Bishops into the colonies seems to have been promoted in the hope of preventing such a catastrophe in Nova Scotia and Canada as that which had rent the United States from the Empire of England. In the cold and apathetic condition of religion at the end of last century and the beginning of this, the invasion by the State of the province of the Church was little thought of either in this country or on the Continent; for the action of our Government in seeking to strengthen the Church by the methods just spoken of was not so violent an interference with her jurisdiction as was the recasting of the Church in France by Napoleon.

The same principles pervaded the Acts of Parliament and the letters patent under which the other Sees created before by brow lege pate

189

valid with was of an that natic (if the Bish that some part redu

186 Tow over

gove

ineff

colo

such

"he

the relig agreectle suit

tablis
—in
as th
forci
who

July

en in

m an

etters

be of

this

s and

power

nfirm

o per-

of a

milar

repro-

rarchy

Impe-

bound

ich its ficers'

report

nglish

ild not

e sum-

his, I

s was

ase of

used

to be the

e been

phe in

Jnited

thetic

begin-

of the

on the

ing to

as not

the re-

nt and

before

1841 were called into existence. Circumstances unforeseen by those to whom their drafting had been entrusted soon brought to the test the worth of the powers and the privileges which the Crown had professed to give by its letters patent.

'In 1842 an active Bishop of Tasmania gave the colonists reason to apprehend that he was about to put his powers into force. Their validity was at once challenged, particularly the power of summoning witnesses; and the matter was referred to the law officers of the Crown, with a request that they would consider "whether any real advantage was to be anticipated from the introduction into the letters patent of any provision whatever beyond the declaration of the royal pleasure that a new Bishopric should be created, with a specified titular designation, and with a distinct specification of the intended See, adding (if that were proper) the appointment by name of the first or original Bishop," and with the observation, perhaps somewhat exaggerated, that "the Bishop to whom such patents had been addressed had sometimes been involved in grave difficulties from regarding every part of them as really operative and effectual, and from attempting to reduce every part of them into practice."

'The law officers, without answering this question, reported that "her Majesty had no authority by letters patent to create the

ecclesiastical jurisdiction complained of "' (pp. 12-13).

The next shock given to the letters patent occurred in 1863, when Mr. Long, a clergyman in the diocese of Cape Town, disputed the bishop's power of exercising jurisdiction over him. In this case it was decided

'that the Bishop's letters patent, being issued after constitutional government had been established in the Cape of Good Hope, were ineffectual to create any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or civil, within the colony, even if it were the intention of the letters patent to create such a jurisdiction, which they think doubtful' (p. 14).

This decision virtually placed the Church of England on the same footing in self-governed colonies with all other religious bodies, and substituted such tribunals as might be agreed upon for the ordinary courts of law for purposes of ecclesiastical discipline. The principle laid down in another suit was virtually adopted. It said—

'The Church of England, in places where there is no Church established by law, is in the same situation with any other religious body—in no better, but in no worse position—and the members may adopt, as the members of any other communion may adopt, rules for enforcing discipline within their body, which will be binding on those who expressly or by implication have assented to them '(p. 14).

In 1864-5 a further and more searching question was

raised. The Bishop of Cape Town, as metropolitan of South Africa, had deposed Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, in virtue of certain metropolitical powers purporting to have been conferred upon him by letters patent issued after the grant of representative institutions to one or both colonies. The Judicial Committee which tried the case decided in the following terms—

'We apprehend it to be clear, on principle, that after the establishment of an independent legislature in the settlements of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal there was no power in the Crown by virtue of its prerogative to establish a metropolitan See or province, or to create an ecclesiastical corporation, whose status, rights, and authority the colony could be required to recognize. It may be true that the Crown, as legal head of the Church, has a right to command the consecration of a Bishop; but it has no power to assign him any diocese or give him any sphere of action within the United Kingdom' (p. 18).

From this it follows that

'in respect to rank and sphere of action, as in respect to jurisdiction, in regard even to the Bishop's right to be considered as an ecclesiastical corporation, it seems that the letters patent are invalid and bad at law, and that nothing passes by them to Dr. Gray or Dr. Colenso, except, perhaps, that they may have been created lay (not ecclesiastical) corporations, with power of making contracts, of holding property, and of suing and being sued, and with territorial titles, like those of dukes and marquises, but with no more status or authority within Cape Town or Natal than a Duke of Devonshire or an Earl of Suffolk in the shires from which they take their designations' (p. 19).

The effect of these decisions was to leave the East and West Indian Bishoprics untouched, because they were established under Act of Parliament; but the West Indian Bishoprics have since entirely changed their position by the disestablishment of the Church. The Crown colonies were also unaffected by the decisions of the State courts, whilst in the other territories connected with the State of England a legal organization of the Church has grown up, by which the control of the internal affairs of the Church has been provided for by Church assemblies that give binding effect to whatever relates to the discipline and the ordering of her services. As a matter of fact

'the colonial Churches have done for themselves, with or without the assistance of colonial legislatures, what the Crown could not do and would no longer affect to do for them. This decision has left the colonial Churches very nearly in the position of the episcopal Churches of Scotland, Ireland, or the United States—voluntary re-

the ma

189

ligi

reli

me sar to ses En bat ber inc Cro Mo Zea suc its Bis of] nee Ind The was pub will Chu Syn alth lette not Guia for t no 1 Chu Can nom crate

Bish

Cana

adju

ligious bodies, "in no better but no worse position" than any other religious body—and legally free to determine what should be the nature of their connexion with the Church of England (of which, of course, communion is the basis), and what the amount of their similarity with that Church in doctrine and ritual' (p. 30).

Another important change has been made, which shows the altered feeling with respect to State influence in Church matters. When the fund for endowing colonial Bishoprics first came into existence the Crown claimed all the appointments, and not only that, but also that it should have the same right to nominate to benefices vacated by their holders to undertake the charge of colonial dioceses that it possessed in the case of clergymen elevated to the episcopate in England. This last claim was allowed for some years, probably to a considerable extent because the patrons of the benefices that would have been in dispute were unwilling to incur the expenditure necessary to resist the claim of the But in 1856 Mr. Harper, the rector of Strathfield Mortimer, was selected for the Bishopric of Christ Church, New Zealand. Eton College was patron of the benefice, and it successfully contested the right of the Crown to interfere with its patronage. With regard to the nomination to colonial Bishoprics, the Crown retains what was allotted to it by Act of Parliament, and in other cases where letters patent are needed before a Bishop can be consecrated. This affects the Indian Sees—Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Lahore, and Rangoon. The same rule applied to Colombo when the present Bishop was appointed; he holds letters patent, and is paid from public funds. But on his avoidance of the See his successor will have to derive his income from another source, as the Church in Ceylon has been disendowed, and the Diocesan Synod, which is recognized by the Legislature, will select, although Ceylon is a Crown colony. In other Crown colonies letters patent have not been continued where the Bishops are not paid by the State. What may happen in the case of Guiana when there is a vacancy is still a matter of speculation; for there concurrent endowment is now the law, and there is no prospect of this law being changed. The claim of the Church to nominate its own Bishops has been worked out in Canada by successive steps. In 1857 the Synod of Toronto nominated a Bishop, who came to England and was consecrated under letters patent. In 1862 it nominated the first Bishop to the new See of Ontario, and he was consecrated in Canada (the first instance) by royal mandate. In 1867 a coadjutor was nominated to the Bishop of Toronto, and applica-

esta-Cape wirtue create ty the rown, ration we him

July

outh

ue of

con-

at of

The

the

detion, lesiasd bad blenso, lesiasolding s, like thority n Earl ations'

est and estaoprics ablishfected er teranizarol of for by relates matter

out the do and left the biscopal tary retion was made to the then Secretary of State for the Colonies (Lord Carnarvon) for a royal mandate. To this request he returned answer that it was beneath the dignity of the Crown to issue a document which had no value, and might be set at

nought in the most complete manner.

For Bishops consecrated in England the royal mandate is still required. This is rarely refused; but in 1874, when a missionary Bishop was sent to Madagascar, the friends of the London Missionary Society represented to the then Foreign Secretary (Lord Granville) the injury which the presence of a Bishop consecrated in England might cause their mission; and for that reason the royal mandate was refused, and the Bishop was consecrated in Scotland. Complete emancipation from State interference cannot, therefore, be said to have been secured; but so much has been gained that what remains is

of comparatively little consequence.

Occasionally there are decisions in our law courts which seem to contradict what has been just set down, but they are felt to be anomalous, and to be the remains of exploded Erastian feeling rather than the expression of the manner in which the laws affecting the Church are to be understood. There was a startling example of this when an appeal came from the diocese of Grahamstown in 1866, respecting the right of the incumbent (called dean) of the cathedral to prohibit his Bishop from preaching therein. 'The church was held by trustees for ecclesiastical purposes in connexion with the Church of England' (p. 35). The Church in South Africa, whilst claiming to be in full communion and sympathy with the Church at home, had formally declared in synod that

'in the interpretation of its standards and formularies the Church of this province be not held to be bound by decisions in questions of faith and doctrine, or in questions of discipline relating to faith and doctrine, other than those of its own ecclesiastical tribunals, or of such other tribunal as may be accepted by the Provincial Synod as a tribunal of appeal' (p. 36).

The Judicial Committee in the case just referred to treated this as a practical abandonment of the English standards of faith and doctrine. In its judgment it says—

'There is not the identity in standards of faith and doctrine which appears to their Lordships necessary to establish the connexion required by the trusts in which the Church of St. George is settled. . . . In England the standard is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted. In South Africa it is the formu-

only on they thin of t of S Maj

189

larie

subj St.]

eccle "An

law of is the part who is to acterpre and to might taking point perfecto say Engla at any count.

found for the deprisof the success the A ment minist It is to

VOI

¹ See Archbishop Tait's Life, ii. 341-9.

onies

st he

rown

set at

ate is

nen a

of the

reign

e of a

ishop

from

been

ains is

which

ey are

Eras-

which

There

from

ght of

oit his

eld by

th the

Africa,

y with

es the

sions in relating

siastical

he Pro-

treated

ards of

doctrine

he con-

eorge is

of the

at

laries as they may be construed without the interpretation. It is argued that the divergence made by the Church of South Africa is only potential and not actual, and that we have no right to speculate on its effect until the tribunals of South Africa have shown whether they will agree or disagree with those of England. Their Lordships think that the divergence is present and actual. It is the agreement of the two Churches which is potential. The ecclesiastical tribunals of South Africa may possibly decide on all important points as her Majesty in Council has done. But the question is whether they have the same standard; and, as has been shown, they have a different standard' (p. 37).

It is worth while to quote Mr. Gladstone's view of this subject as expressed in his speech at the recent meeting in St. James's Hall:— 1

'The Judicial Committee treat this practical repudiation of their ecclesiastical authority to be an abandonment of-what do you think? "An abandonment of the English standards of faith and doctrine." . . . This is certainly to me a most astounding statement. That the law of the land is entitled to be obeyed, that I can understand. That is the doctrine of law and order; but it is absurd to say that that is part of the standard of faith and doctrine, for that is to say that all who accept the Apostles' Creed, or the Nicene Creed, are not merely to accept that doctrine, but are to submit to, and be bound by, any interpretation that any civil court may put upon any part of that Creed, and that if we do not accept it, we are not only bad citizens-that might be argued; I can understand it; it is a difficult point-but taking the standard of faith and doctrine, if that is so, I say that in point of fact the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed are very imperfect, and ought to have added to each of them a separate article to say that all men, in order to be good Christians-in the Church of England at any rate—must be bound to accept whatever sense may at any time be affixed to these Creeds by the civil tribunals of the country.'

Probably, as growing out of this decision, it has been found impracticable to make use of the endowment provided for the See of Natal since the death of Bishop Colenso. The few colonists who clung to his communion after his deprivation by Bishop Gray as Primate, with the assistance of the Bishops of the province, were desirous of having a successor to Bishop Colenso consecrated at his death. This the Archbishop of Canterbury declined to do; but the endowment has not been claimed for the Bishop of Maritzburg, who ministers to Churchmen in what was the diocese of Natal. It is to be hoped that after a short lapse of time this difficulty

1 Guardian, June 24, 1891.

VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

GG

180

bes

gre

put

nee

tha

hea

Ou

who

loya

moi

pur

is sa

they

little

relig

abai

or ce

there

of n

mad

habit

true

Jesus

velop

the o

insup

possi

Calcu

Parlia

vided

bound

reason

lature

Churc

overlo

with t

The E

been f

effort i

Gover

the ot

secure

manne

spread

we reg

will be overcome, and the Church will be allowed profitably

to employ funds that are rightfully hers.

The action of the Colonial Bishoprics Endowment Fund has indirectly had another advantage, which we ought not to be unwilling to allow. By raising funds from voluntary sources to endow Bishoprics in the colonies, it brought home to the minds of Churchmen the possibility of obtaining in a similar manner the money that was needed to extend the episcopate at home. To effect this object seemed beset with difficulties; but when it had been demonstrated by experience that what was wanted for the colonies could thus be accomplished, it was felt to be infinitely less difficult to apply the

same principle at home.

From what has been said it will have been seen that much has been done for the extension of the colonial episcopate; but more remains to be done. With the extension of our missions and the development of our colonies the cry arises continually for more help. Scarcely a year passes without one or more new Bishoprics being created, and it is obviously most desirable that no Bishop should be dependent for his maintenance upon the annual vote of a society or upon money furnished out of its coffers. Such a state of things is apt to colour the appointments made, and to lead people to suppose that the furtherance of the views of one or other school of thought in the Church will have undue prominence in the conduct of the mission. At the present time there are fourteen Sees whose Bishops are supported by missionary societies in England; three others are supported partly by endowment and partly by missionary societies, whilst other three are maintained partly by endowment and partly by public funds. To furnish what is needed for the permanent maintenance of these existing Sees, therefore, demands a considerable effort on the part of the Church, whilst the call for the extension of the episcopate in many portions of the world is loud, and may be expected to become louder If the Church is to keep pace with our enterprising colonists in South Africa, who are advancing northwards into Mashonaland; if the cause of religion is to be shown to be as precious to those who believe in its power as the chartered companies prove that the extension of English trade and influence is to men occupied with this world's business, there must be no shrinking from sending forth the ministrations of the Church in their completeness wherever commercial or colonizing efforts are bringing fresh countries into closer relations with our empire. But,

Fund not to intary home g in a and the et with erience accom-

ly the n that l episension he cry passes d it is endent iety or tate of to lead of one undue present ted by pported ocieties, ent and for the ore, den, whilst portions e louder enterg northn is to e in its extenoccupied ng from eir com-

re bring-

re. But,

beside this, Japan and China with their teeming millions call for greater efforts for their evangelization than have hitherto been And last, but perhaps most important of all, India needs much more to be done for the conversion of the more than two hundred millions of our fellow subjects who are still heathens or Mahomedans than has hitherto been attempted. Our rulers there have apparently been more disposed to trust wholly to the power of the sword for securing good order and loyalty to the Throne, and have seemed inclined to regard moral and spiritual influences as of small account, purely seculare ducation which is being provided for the natives is said to have loosened their hold upon the religions which they previously professed, but there has been comparatively little accomplished towards leading them to accept a true religion instead of the false one which many of them are abandoning. Believing, as we do, that no nation can prosper or continue contented or happy without religion, we feel that there must be the greatest danger of ruin to the country, and of misery to the people of India, if earnest efforts are not made to take advantage of the present crisis in their religious habits and beliefs to instil into their hearts a knowledge of the true God, and of the salvation purchased for all by our Lord Jesus Christ. Until quite recently the hindrances to the development of the Church's ministrations in that country, by the organization of Sees of moderate size, have seemed to be insuperable, and even now it cannot be said that what seems possible is perfectly satisfactory. The three Bishoprics of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay having been founded with Parliamentary authority, and the incomes of the Bishops provided out of public funds, it is impossible to alter their boundaries without the authority of Parliament, and many reasons seem to make it undesirable to appeal to the Legislature, as it is now constituted, on any questions affecting the Church. It has, therefore, been decided to appoint Bishops to overlook certain portions of the country on an arrangement with the existing Bishops whose Sees possess a legal status. The Bishoprics of Lahore, Burmah, and Chota Nagpore have been founded on this basis, the Church at home by voluntary effort furnishing half the income of the Bishops, and the Indian Government giving a senior chaplaincy to each to provide the other portion of it. An effort is now being made to secure an income for the Bishop of Tinnevelly in a similar manner. We look hopefully forward to increased efforts for spreading the Gospel in this important part of our empire, and we regard what has been done as the harbinger of a brighter

day, and we venture to hope that as the action of the Church in spreading the Anglican Episcopate has been productive of so much good indirectly, as well as directly, to the furtherance of religious truth and the emancipation of religious interests from secular control, so the same good Providence that has led those responsible for what has been done thus far prosperously will still further aid the good work, and strengthen the hands of those in authority until the Church in India is blessed with such a measure of freedom to carry on her evangelizing efforts as will enable her to fulfil the great work to which she is called.

It would be impossible to close this article without some further notice of the important meeting held at St. James's Hall on the 19th of June last, to celebrate the jubilee of that excellent society of whose good work we have been speaking, and to reawaken the zeal and enthusiasm which were kindled half a century since, and to which the whole Anglican communion owes so deep a debt. Mr. Gladstone, from whose speech we have already quoted, who took part in the meeting in 1841, and has been one of the treasurers of the fund from its inception, was the chief speaker, and luminously and eloquently set forth the great work which has been accomplished, and the principles which have guided those responsible for its administration. To set forth the arguments used by this illustrious statesman and the other speakers would demand a repetition of much that we have already Suffice it to say that there was a considerable amount of enthusiasm manifested by the influential assembly that was gathered to rejoice over what had been accomplished, and to hear how much still remains to be done. And it must not be forgotten that in all efforts to extend the influence of the Church, success ever makes new demands for more labourers and more extended organizations. It remains to be seen whether the hearts and hands of Churchmen are as open now to make large gifts at the cost of personal sacrifice for this great work as they were half a century since; and notwithstanding the excessive multiplication of the demands upon their attention and their purses, we trust that they will not be found wanting.

Li

IT his gra WO SOC ope hac his froi he and frie bot was hav alas befo to c -u and dow The bere and Hou lack abili a cr not ! Mr. min faile who

> upor too him more dete

ART. VIII.-LORD HOUGHTON.

Life, Letters, and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, first Lord Houghton. By T. WEMYSS REID. Second Edition, 2 vols. (London, 1890.)

IT is much to be regretted that Lord Houghton did not write his own biography. Those who know his delightful Monographs, Social and Personal, can form some idea of how he would have treated it. From his early years Milnes lived in society—not merely the society to which his birth naturally opened the door, but a varied society of his own creating. He had an insatiable curiosity. It is hardly too much to say that in his long life he was present at every ceremony of importance, from the Eglinton Tournament to the Œcumenical Council; he knew everybody that was worth knowing, both at home and abroad-not merely as chance acquaintances, but as friends with whom he maintained a correspondence. He was both a politician and a man of letters, a friend of the unwashed and the associate of princes. What a book might have been written by such a man on such a subject! But, alas! though he often spoke of writing his own life, he died before he had leisure even to begin it; and, instead, we have to content ourselves with Mr. Reid's volumes. They are good -unquestionably good; they abound with amusing stories and brilliant witticisms; but we confess that we laid them down with a sense of disappointment which it is hard to define. They are at once too long and too short. They are encumbered with numerous details with which we could well dispense, and they fail to set before us a consistent view of Lord Houghton's character. In a word, they lack charm, and they lack dramatic power. Perhaps it was beyond the writer's ability to draw so complex a character—a man of many moods, a creature of contradictions, a master of what not to do and not to say, as a lady of fashion told him to his face; perhaps Mr. Reid was overweighted by his wish to bring into prominence those solid qualities in his hero which society often failed to discover, while judging only 'the man of fashion, whose unconventional originality had so far impressed itself upon the popular mind that there was hardly any eccentricity too audacious to be attributed to him by those who knew him only by repute.' We wish, too, that Mr. Reid had been more careful in the technical part of his work. We have detected some clerical errors, and not a few mistakes; and

of the cously been those ments eakers ready mount at was and to not be of the courers

e seen

n now

or this

twith-

upon

vill not

July

urch ve of

ance

s led

ously

ands

izing h she

some

mes's

ee of

been

which

whole

stone.

art in

why, we may ask, are we not allowed dates at the top of the page, or a list of Lord Houghton's works at the end of the volume? Such a list, if carefully drawn up, would have been of itself a literary biography. The index, too, is the very worst that we ever had the misfortune to consult. Here, however, let us turn to the more agreeable task of praise. As a contribution to the literary and social history of the last half-century, Mr. Reid's book will well repay a careful study. In what we have to say we shall attempt to sketch Lord Houghton's life with the help of the materials that he has brought together, and a few personal recollections.

Richard Monckton Milnes was born in London, June 19, His father, Robert Pemberton Milnes, then a young man of twenty-five, and M.P. for the family borough of Pontefract, had just flashed into sudden celebrity in the House of Commons by a brilliant speech in favour of Mr. Canning, which saved the Portland Administration, and would have made Mr. Milnes's political fortune, had he been so minded. when Mr. Perceval offered him a seat in the Cabinet, either as Chancellor of the Exchequer or as Secretary of War, he exclaimed, 'Oh, no: I will not accept either; with my temperament, I should be dead in a year.' That he had entered Parliament with high hopes, and confidence in his own powers to win distinction there, is plain from the well-known story (which his son evidently believed) that he laid a bet of 100%. that he would be Chancellor of the Exchequer in five years. But, when the time came, he declined to 'take occasion by the hand,' and sat down under the oaks of Fryston to spend the rest of his life, just half a century, in the placid uniformity of a country gentleman's existence. 'My own order,' he proudly noted in a journal printed for private circulation, 'is one which no sovereign but ours of England has, and which kings and princes have no conception of-its supporters, the horse and the fox; its crest, my own, the wheatsheaf; its motto, hospitality.' His abandonment of public life, and his refusal to return to it in any form, even when, late in life, Lord Palmerston offered him a peerage, was an unsolved riddle to his contem-Those who read these volumes will have but little poraries. difficulty in finding an answer to it. He was endowed with a proud independence of judgment which could never bind itself to any political party, and a critical fastidiousness which made him hesitate over every question presented to him. These two qualities of mind were conspicuous in his son, and barred to some extent his advancement, as they had barred

his fa an in hound stimu which left it intere Occas York: that which of his his fo were knew -the and f he sp

again

1891

its ap T senter an en and h to Ti entere traini older friend celebr at his wall, visits of the trial 7 is no the B reply. Genes the Ol for 'th to Th merel he be

was or

1891

f the been very Here, raise. f the areful ketch at he

ne 19, roung conteuse of ning, made But either ar, he tem-

story 1001. years. by the d the ity of

which
gs and
se and
hospisal to
erston

ntemt little d with r bind which

n, and barred his father's. It must not, however, be imagined that he was an indolent man. Far from it. He was a daring rider to hounds, a scientific agriculturist, an active magistrate, a stimulator of the waning Toryism of Yorkshire by speeches which showed what the House of Commons had lost when he left it, and ardently curious about men of note and events of interest—another characteristic which descended to his son. Occasionally, too, he yielded to a love of excitement which Yorkshire could not gratify, and revisited London, to tempt that fickle goddess who presides over high play-a taste which cost him dear, for it compelled him to pass several years of his life in comparative obscurity abroad, while the rents in his fortune, due to his own and his brother's extravagance, were being slowly repaired. We have been told, by one who knew him late in life, that he was a singularly loveable person -the delight of children and young people-full of jokes, and fun, and persiflage. 'You could never be sure whether he spoke in jest or in earnest,' said our informant. Here again one of the most obvious characteristics of his son makes

its appearance.

The boyhood of Richard Milnes may be passed over in a sentence. A serious illness when he was ten years old put an end to his father's intention of sending him to Harrow, and he was educated at home, or near it, till he went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October 1827. He was entered as a fellow-commoner-a position well suited to the training he had received, for it gave him the society of men older than himself, while he was looking out for congenial friends among men of his own age. His college tutor was the celebrated Whewell, afterwards Master, and it was doubtless at his suggestion that he went to read classics with Thirlwall, then one of the resident Fellows. On one of his later visits to Cambridge Lord Houghton told an interesting story of their relations as pupil and instructor After a few days' trial Thirlwall said to him: 'You will never be a scholar. It is no use our reading classics together. Have you ever read the Bible?' 'Yes, I have read it, but not critically,' was the reply. 'Very well,' said Thirlwall, 'then let us begin with Genesis.' And so the rest of the term was spent in the study of the Old Testament. Mr. Reid is, no doubt, right in saying that, for 'the making of his mind,' Milnes was more deeply indebted to Thirlwall than to any other man. But Thirlwall was not merely the Gamaliel at whose feet Milnes was willing to sit; he became the chosen friend of his heart. Lord Houghton was once asked to name the most remarkable man whom he

S

iı

fe

ta

b

e

0

F p

S

li

N

b

b

0

k

n

tl

W

e

Se

had known in his long experience. Without a moment's hesitation he replied 'Thirlwall'; and the numerous letters which Mr. Reid has printed show that the friendship was equally strong on both sides.

The most picturesque of Roman historians said of one of his heroes that he was felix opportunitate mortis; it might be said of Milnes, with regard to Cambridge, that he was felix opportunitate vitæ. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a period in which so many men who afterwards made their mark in the world have been gathered together there; and, with a happy facility for discovering and attracting to himself whatever was eminent and worth knowing, it was not long before he became intimate with the best of those who there

'held debate, a band Of youthful friends, on mind and art, And labour, and the changing mart, And all the framework of the land.'

Nearly forty years afterwards, in 1866, on the occasion of the opening of the new rooms of the Union Society, he commemorated these friends of his early years in a speech of singular beauty and sincerity:—

'There was Tennyson, the Laureate, whose goodly bay-tree decorates our language and our land; Arthur, the younger Hallam, the subject of In Memoriam, the poet and his friend passing, linked hand in hand, together down the slopes of fame. There was Trench, the present Archbishop of Dublin, and Alford, Dean of Canterbury, both profound Scriptural philologists who have not disdained the secular muse. There was Spedding, who has, by a philosophical affinity, devoted the whole of his valuable life to the rehabilitation of the character of Lord Bacon; and there was Merivale, who-I hope by some attraction of repulsion—has devoted so much learning to the vindication of the Cæsars. There were Kemble and Kinglake, the historian of our earliest civilization and of our latest war-Kemble as interesting an individual as ever was pourtrayed by the dramatic genius of his own race; Kinglake as bold a man-at-arms in literature as ever confronted public opinion. There was Venables, whose admirable writings, unfortunately anonymous, we are reading every day, without knowing to whom to attribute them; and there was Blakesley, the "Hertfordshire Incumbent" of the Times. There were sons of families which seemed to have an hereditary right to, a sort of habit of, academic distinction, like the Heaths and the Lushingtons. But I must check this throng of advancing memories, and I will pass from this point with the mention of two names which you would not let me omit one of them, that of your Professor of Greek, whom it is the honour of Her Majesty's late Government to have made Master of Trinity; and the other, that of ment's letters ip was

July

of one might ne was imposrwards ogether attractlowing, best of

sion of ety, he speech

bay-tree Hallam, , linked Trench, terbury, ned the sophical oilitation who-I learning d Kingst warby the -at-arms enables, reading nd there There right to, and the emories,

names

our Pro-

ty's late that of your latest Professor, Mr. F. D. Maurice, in whom you will all soon recognize the true enthusiasm of humanity' (vol. ii. p. 161).

Mr. Reid tells us that Tennyson sought Milnes's acquaintance because 'he looks the best-tempered fellow I ever saw.' Hallam proclaimed him to be 'a kindhearted fellow, as well as a very clever one, but vain and paradoxical.' Milnes himself put Hallam at the head of those whom he knew. 'He is the only man of my standing,' he wrote, 'before whom

I bow in conscious inferiority in everything.'

It was hardly to be expected that Milnes, with his taste for the general in literature rather than the particular, would achieve distinction in the Cambridge of 1830. We have seen how Thirlwall disposed of his classical aspirations, and in mathematics he fared no better. He read hard, and hoped for distinction in the college examination. But he had overtaxed his energies; his health gave way, and he was forced to give up work altogether for some days. Happily, the benefit a man derives from his three years at a university need not be measured by his honours, and we may be sure that the experience of men and books that Milnes gained there was of greater service to him than a high place in any Tripos. He roamed in all directions over the fields of knowledge; phrenology, anatomy, geology, political economy, metaphysics, by turns engaged his attention; he dabbled in periodical literature; he acted Beatrice in Much Ado about Nothing, and Mrs. Malaprop in The Rivals; he made an excursion in a balloon with the celebrated aeronaut, Mr. Green; he wrote two prize-poems, Timbuctoo and Byzantium, but only to be beaten by Tennyson and Kinglake; he obtained a second prize for an English declamation, and a first prize for an English essay, On the Homeric Poems; he became a member of the club called 'The Apostles,' in which he maintained a kindly interest to the end of his life; and last, but by no means least, he was a constant speaker at the Union. this capacity he evidently achieved distinction, for he was one of the three members selected as a deputation to Oxford 'to assert the right of Shelley to be considered a greater poet than Byron.' The other two were Hallam, and Sunderland, whom Milnes considered to be 'the greatest speaker he had ever heard—the man with the strongest oratorical gift'; but Sir Francis Doyle has recorded that it was Milnes himself who made the most favourable impression at Oxford.

Mr. Milnes had always wished that his son should become distinguished in that House of Commons where he had himself made so brilliant a debut. With this object in view, he

189

Fre

eag

lite

spe

sus of

Bra

his

ma mig

dee

for the

the visi

he

the

wai

no: Mil

fori

fam

oth

alw

and

Mil

in t foll

had urged him to cultivate speaking in public, and probably the only part of his Cambridge career which he viewed with complete satisfaction was his interest in, and success at, the Union Debating Society. But even in this they did not quite agree. Mr. Milnes urged his son to take a decided line, and to lead the Union. But the only answer he could get was, 'If there is one thing on which I have ever prided myself, it is on having no politics at all, and judging every measure by its individual merits. A leader there must be a violent politician and a party politician, or he must have a private party. I shall never be the one or have the other.' Again, they were at variance on the burning question of the day, the Reform Bill. Mr. Milnes, though a Conservative, was in favour of it; his son described it as 'the curse and degradation of the nation.' Further, while exhorting his son to prepare himself for public life, with a singleness of purpose that, if adhered to, would have excluded other and more congenial pursuits, Mr. Milnes warned him that his circumstances would not allow him to enter parliament. No wonder, therefore, that the young man became perplexed and melancholy, and more than ever anxious to find a refuge for his aspirations in literature.

While these questions were pending between father and son, the pecuniary embarrassments to which we have already alluded entered upon an acute stage, and the whole family left England for five years. If Mr. Milnes was in any way responsible for this, it was a crime which brought its own punishment with it; for it was this enforced residence on the Continent which, more than any other influence, shaped the character of his son. Mr. Milnes evidently wished him to become a country gentleman like himself, and, if he must write, 'a pamphleteer on guano and on grain.' Instead of this, while he kept his loyalty to England with unbroken faith, he divested himself of English narrowness, and acquired that intimate knowledge of the other members of the European family, and, we may add, that catholicity of taste, for which he was so conspicuous. Probably no public man of the present century understood the Continent so well as Milnes. In many ways he was a typical Englishman; but he was also a citizen

of the world.

Boulogne-which in 1829, it must be remembered, was still a French town—was the first resting-place of the family, and there Milnes made his first acquaintance with Frenchmen and their literature. The romantic school was beginning to engross public attention, and Victor Hugo-then, as afterwards, the 'stormy voice of France'-became his favourite

XUM

July

bly

vith

the

uite

and

vas,

f, it

by

oli-

rty.

vere

orm

fit;

the

self

l to,

Mr.

low

ung

ever

and

ady

nily

way

own

the

the

n to

d of

ken

ired

pean

hich

sent

izen

was

nily,

men

g to

fter-

urite

French poet. But, much as Milnes loved France, he was too eager for knowledge to be content with one language and one literature, and, rejecting his father's suggestion that he should spend some time in Paris, he spent most of the summer and autumn of 1830 at Bonn, in order to learn German. We suspect that he must have taken this step at the suggestion of Thirlwall, for it was he who introduced him to Professor Brandis, and probably also to the veteran Niebuhr. Thence, his family having migrated to Milan, he crossed the Alps, and made his first acquaintance with Italy, which became, we might almost say, the country of his adoption. He felt a deep sympathy for the Italian people in their aspirations for liberty, and though, as was natural at his age, he enjoyed the society of the Austrian vice-regal Court, he longed to see the foreigner expelled from Italy. Other Italian cities were visited in due course, and, lastly, Rome. Wherever he went, he managed, with a skill that was peculiarly his own, to know the most interesting people, and to be welcomed with equal warmth by persons of the most opposite opinions. It was no small feat to have known both Italians and Austrians at Milan; but at Rome, besides his English acquaintances, he formed lasting friendships with the Chevalier Bunsen and his family, and with Dr. Wiseman, M. Rio, M. Montalembert, and other Catholics of distinction. The Church of Rome must always have great attractions for a young man of deep feeling and with no settled principles of faith, and we gather that Milnes was at one time not indisposed to join it. His feelings in that time of unrest and perplexity are well indicated in the following lines, written at Rome in 1834:-

'To search for lore in spacious libraries,
And find it hid in tongues to you unknown;
To wait deaf-eared near swelling minstrelsies,
Watch every action, but not catch one tone;
Amid a thousand breathless votaries,
To feel yourself dry-hearted as a stone—
Are images of that which, hour by hour,
Consumes my heart, the strife of Will and Power.

'The Beauty of the past before my eyes
Stands ever in each fable haunted place,
I know her form in every dark disguise,
But never look upon her open face;
O'er every limb a veil thick-folded lies,
Showing poor outline of a perfect grace,
Yet just enough to make the sickened mind
Grieve doubly for the treasures hid behind.

h

n

E

b

tı

W

SI

e

tl

b

h

li

n

iı

a

d

h

C

t

b

n

'O Thou! to whom the wearisome disease
Of Past and Present is an alien thing,
Thou pure Existence! whose severe decrees
Forbid a living man his soul to bring
Into a timeless Eden of sweet ease,
Clear-eyed, clear-hearted—lay thy loving wing
In death upon me—if that way alone
Thy great creation-thought thou wilt to me make known.' 1

An interesting picture of Milnes at about this period has been drawn by Mr. Aubrey de Vere, whom he visited in Ireland during one of his brief absences from Italy.

'He remained with us a good many days, though when he left us they seemed too few. We showed him whatever of interest our neighbourhood boasts, and he more than repaid us by the charm of his conversation, his lively descriptions of foreign ways, his goodhumour, his manifold accomplishments, and the extraordinary range of his information, both as regards books and men. He could hardly have then been more than two-and-twenty, and yet he was already well acquainted with the languages and literatures of many different countries, and not a few of their most distinguished men, living or recently dead. I well remember the vivid picture which he drew of Niebuhr's profound grief at the downfall of the restored monarchy in France, at the renewal of its Revolution in 1830. He was delivering a series of historical lectures at the time, and Milnes was one of the young men attending the course. One day they had long to wait for their Professor; at last the aged historian entered the lecture-hall, his form drooping, and his whole aspect grief-stricken. 'Gentlemen,' he said, 'I have no apology for detaining you; a calamity has befallen Europe which must undo all the restorative work recently done, and throw back her social and political progress-perhaps for centuries. The Revolution has broken out again' (vol. i. p. 115).

One episode of these foreign experiences deserves a separate notice. In 1832 Milnes spent some months in Greece with his friend Mr. Christopher Wordsworth, a scholar whose Athens and Attica has long been a classical text-book. But Milnes was more powerfully attracted by the sight of Grecian independence than by the relics of her ancient glory. The volume which he published on his return, called Memorials of a Tour in some parts of Greece, chiefly Poetical (his first independent literary venture, it may be remarked), contains but scanty references to antiquity. He was keenly interested in the efforts of Greece to obtain a settled government of her own, and through all the drawbacks and discomforts which, as a traveller, he had to endure from the Greeks, he firmly ad-

¹ The Poems of Richard Monckton Milnes, 2 vols. (London, 1838), vol. i. p. 93.

own.' 1
od has

July

left us est our narm of goody range hardly already ifferent ving or drew of rchy in livering of the wait for re-hall, lemen. befallen ne, and nturies.

Greece whose to But Grecian to The rials of tinderins but sted in of her hich, as mly ad-

n, 1838),

hered to the cause of freedom. He even advocated the immediate restoration of the Elgin marbles to the Parthenon. But Milnes had a mind which was singularly free from prejudice, and even in those early days he had learnt to consider both sides of every question, and to keep his sympathies controlled by his judgment. He probably approached Greece with the enthusiasm for a liberated nation which had so deeply stirred even the most indifferent in England; but he left it with an affection for the Turkish character which he never entirely lost, and which enabled him in very different days, then far distant, to understand the political exigencies of the East better than many politicians of more pretentious character and fame.'

We have dwelt on Milnes's early years at some length, because their history throws considerable light on his subsequent career, and accounts for most of the difficulties that he experienced when he made his first entrance into London society. 'Conceive the man,' said Carlyle: 'a most blandsmiling, semi-quizzical, affectionate, high-bred, Italianised little man, who has long olive-blonde hair, a dimple, next to no chin, and flings his arm round your neck when he addresses you in public society!' If the rough Scotch moralist was not in an unusually bad humour when he wrote these words, it is not to be wondered at that Milnes was regarded for a time as a dangerous person, 'anxious to introduce foreign ways and fashions into the conservative fields of English life.' But this dislike of him was very transient, and in less than a year after his return to England he had 'made a conquest of the social world.' That he was still looked upon as an oddity seems certain, and even his intimate friend Charles Buller could exclaim: 'I often think how puzzled your Maker must be to account for your conduct;' but people soon became willing to accept him on his own terms for the sake of his wit and brilliancy, and, we may add, of his kind heart. Some nicknames that survived long after their application had lost its point, are worth remembering as illustrations of what was once thought of him; perhaps still more for the sake of the letter which Sydney Smith wrote on being accused, quite groundlessly, of having invented them.

'Dear Milnes,—Never lose your good temper, which is one of your best qualities, and which has carried you hitherto safely through your startling eccentricities. If you turn cross and touchy, you are a lost man. No man can combine the defects of opposite characters. The names of "Cool of the evening," "London Assurance," and "In-I-go Jones," are, I give you my word, not mine. They are of no sort

of importance; they are safety-valves, and if you could by paying sixpence get rid of them, you had better keep your money. You do me but justice in acknowledging that I have spoken much good of you. I have laughed at you for those follies which I have told you of to your face; but nobody has more readily and more earnestly asserted that you are a very agreeable, clever man, with a very good heart, unimpeachable in all the relations of life, and that you amply deserve to be retained in the place to which you had too hastily elevated yourself by manners unknown to our cold and phlegmatic people. I thank you for what you say of my good-humour. Lord Dudley, when I took leave of him, said to me: "You have been laughing at me for the last seven years, and you never said anything which I wished unsaid." This pleased me.

'Ever yours,

'SYDNEY SMITH.'1

When we read that Milnes 'made a conquest of society,' it must not be supposed that he was a mere pleasure-seeker. On the contrary, as Mr. Reid says in another place, 'he had too great a reverence for what was good and pure and true, too consuming a desire to hold his own with the best intellects of his time, and, above all, too deep a sympathy with the suffering and the wronged to allow him to fall a victim to these temptations.' From the first, then, he 'sought to combine the world of pleasure and the world of intellect.' list of his friends would contain the names of the best-known men of the day, but, at the same time, men who had but little in common: Carlyle, Sterling, Maurice, Spedding, Thackeray, Tennyson, Landor, Hallam, Rogers, Macaulay, Sydney Smith. 'He became an intimate member of circles differing so widely from each other as those of Lansdowne House, Holland House, Gore House, and the Sterling Club; and his own fame as a host was soon noised abroad for an audacious mingling of elements the most discordant.

'Mr. Vavasour,' wrote Disraeli in *Tancred*, 'saw something good in everybody and everything, which is certainly amiable, and perhaps just, but disqualifies a man in some degree for the business of life, which requires for its conduct a certain degree of prejudice. Mr. Vavasour's breakfasts were renowned. Whatever your creed, clars, or merit—one might almost add, your character—you were a welcome guest at his matutinal meal, provided you were celebrated. That qualification, however, was rigidly enforced. He prided himself on figuring as the social medium by which rival reputations became acquainted, and paid each other in his presence the compliments which veiled their ineffable disgust' (vol. i. p. 337).

When some one asked if a celebrated murderer had been ¹ Vol. i. p. 214.

10

n

le

u

tl

T

d

d

to

paying ou do ood of ld you rnestly y good

July

amply hastily gmatic Lord been ything

ciety,' eeker. e had l true, ellects th the cim to

mown t little keray, Smith. videly olland own acious

g good erhaps of life, Mr. class, elcome That self on ecame iments

been

hanged, the reply he got was: 'I hope so, or Richard will have him at his breakfast-table next Thursday;' and Thirlwall, when his friend was on the brink of marriage, thus alludes to past felicity:—

'It is very likely, nay certain, that you will still collect agreeable people about your wife's breakfast-table; but can I ever sit down there without the certainty that I shall meet with none but respectable persons? It may be an odd thing for a Bishop to lament, but I cannot help it' (vol. i. p. 448).

After all it seems probable that Milnes himself, and not the lion of the hour, was the chief attraction at those parties. He delighted in the best sort of conversation—that which he called 'the rapid counterplay and vivid exercise of combined intelligences,' and he did his best to revive the practice of that almost forgotten art—*l'art de causer*. As Mr. Reid says:—

'How brilliant and amusing he was over the dinner-table or the breakfast-table was known to all his friends. Overflowing with information, his mind was lightened by a bright wit, whilst his immense stores of appropriate anecdotes enabled him to give point and colour to every topic which was brought under discussion' (vol. i. p. 189).

At the same time he did not fall into the fatal error of taking the talk into his own hands, and delivering a monologue, as too many social celebrities have done before and since. He had the happy art of making his guests talk, while he listened and threw in a remark from time to time, to give new life when the conversation seemed to flag. Carlyle, in a letter written to his wife during his first visit to Fryston, gives us a lifelike portrait of Milnes when thus engaged:—

'Richard, I find, lays himself out while in this quarter to do hospitalities, and of course to collect notabilities about him, and play them off one against the other. I am his trump-card at present. The Sessions are at Pontefract even now, and many lawyers there. These last two nights he has brought a trio of barristers to dine, producing champagne, &c. . . Last night our three was admitted to be a kind of failure, three greater blockheads ye wadna find in Christendee. Richard had to exert himself; but he is really dexterous, the villain. He pricks you with questions, with remarks, with all kinds of fly-tackle to make you bite, does generally contrive to get you into some sort of speech. And then his good humour is extreme; you look in his face and forgive him all his tricks' (vol. i. p. 256).

As a pendant to this we will quote Mr. Forster's description of Milnes and Carlyle together:—

'Monckton Milnes came yesterday and left this morning—a pleasant, companionable little man—delighting in paradoxes, but

18

to

sp

H

M

TH

ev

Ph

un

vie

to

ret

wh

cha

rig

the

Ea

lett

vat

but

Pa

mo

and

nai

the

and

lane

Gla

mat

sup

him

pose

app.

long

supp

ing

this

he r

disa

came

lords

self i

never

good-humoured ones; defending all manner of people and principles in order to provoke Carlyle to abuse them, in which laudable enterprise he must have succeeded to his heart's content, and for a time we had a most amusing evening, reminding me of a naughty boy rubbing a fierce cat's tail backwards, and getting in between furious growls and fiery sparks. He managed to avoid the threatened scratches' (vol. i. p. 387).

Milnes entered Parliament in 1837 as Conservative member for Pontefract. His friends were rather surprised at his selection of a party, for even then his views on most subjects were decidedly Liberal. Thirlwall, for instance, wrote:—

'I can hardly bring myself now to consider you as a Tory, or indeed as belonging to a party at all; and although I am aware how difficult, and even dangerous, it is for a public man to keep aloof from all parties, still my first hope as well as expectation as to your political career is that it may be distinguished by some degree of originality' (vol. i. p. 199).

These hopes were realized to an extent that none of Milnes's friends would have expected or even desired. From the outset he maintained an independence of thought and action which did him the utmost credit as a man of honour. but which ruined his chances of obtaining that success which is measured by the attainment of official dignity. And yet, as Mr. Reid tells us, he was more ambitious of political than of literary distinction. But the fates were against him. first place, his style of speaking did not suit the House. 'had modelled himself on the old style of political oratory, and gave his hearers an impression of affectation.' Then he would not vote straight with his party. He took a line of his own about Canada and the Ballot; he voted on the opposite side to Peel on the question of a large remission of capital punishments; and he wrote One Tract More, 'an eloquent and earnest plea for toleration for the Anglo-Catholic enthusiasm,' which shocked the Protestants in general, and the electors of Pontefract in particular. Perhaps he was too much in earnest; perhaps he was not a sufficiently important person to be silenced by office; perhaps, as Mr. Reid says, public opinion in England always insists upon drawing a broad line of demarcation between the man of letters and the man of affairs;' but whatever might be the reason, Sir Robert Peel passed him over when forming his Administration in 1841—nay, rather, appears never to have turned his thoughts in his direction. Milnes was grievously disappointed, but with characteristic lightheartedness set at once

-

XUM

1891

ıly

les

er-

ne

OOY

ous

ed

ive

sed

ost

ce,

or,

ow

om

oli-

rigi-

of

om

and

our,

nich

yet,

n of

the

He

ory,

n he

f his

osite

pital

uent

thu-

the

too

rtant

says,

ng a

l the

stra-

d his

isap-

once

to work to make himself more thoroughly fit for the post he specially coveted, the Under-Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs. He went to Paris, got intimate with Guizot, De Tocqueville, Montalembert- that English aristocrat foisted into the middle of French democracy'-and other leading statesmen. Through them, and by help of his natural gift of knowing everybody he wished to know, he managed to include Louis Philippe among those by whom he was accepted as a sort of unaccredited English envoy. He kept Peel informed of the views of Guizot and the King, and Peel replied with a message to the former in a letter which shows that he was quite ready to make use of Milnes, though not to reward him. On his return he gave Peel a general support on the Corn Laws, while regretting that his 'measures were not of a more liberal character;' he interested himself in the passing of the Copyright Bill, a measure in respect of which he was accepted as the representative of men of letters; and he travelled in the East, no doubt to study Oriental politics on the spot. A letter he wrote to Peel from Smyrna is full of shrewd observation and far-reaching insight into the Eastern Question; but, on his return, he published a volume of poems called Palm Leaves. Now Peel, like a certain Hanoverian monarch who hated 'boetry and bainters,' hated literature: and, as Milnes's father told him, 'every book he wrote was a nail in his political coffin.' Again, Milnes was in favour of the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, and had written a pamphlet called The Real Union of England and Ireland, on which, we may note, in passing, Mr. Gladstone's remark, that he had 'some opinions on Irish matters that are not fit for practice.' With these views he supported Peel's grant to Maynooth, a step which brought him into such disgrace at Pontefract that he seriously proposed to give up parliamentary life altogether. In fact he applied for a diplomatic post, but without success. Before long we find him again running counter to his chief's policy, supporting Lord Ashley against the Government, and seconding a motion of Charles Buller's against Lord Stanley. After this it cannot excite surprise that Peel passed him over when he rearranged his Administration in 1845. With his second disappointment Milnes's career as a professional politician came to an end. Ten years later Palmerston offered him a lordship of the Treasury, but he declined it. As he said himself in a letter written shortly afterwards:-

'Via media never answers in politics, and somehow or other I never can get out of it. My Laodicean spirit is the ruin of me. VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

C

th

fa

T

fa

du

th

CO

TH

ter

rea

suj

From having lived with all sorts of people, and seen good in all, the broad black lines of judgment that people usually draw seem to me false and foolish, and I think my own finer ones just as distinct, though no one can see them but myself' (vol. i. p. 360).

Before long Milnes found a more congenial position on the opposite side of the House. But it must not be supposed that he rushed into sudden and rancorous opposition to his old leader. So long as Peel remained in office, he allowed no personal considerations to interfere with his support of him; and he steadily refused to join those who rebelled when he announced his conversion to Free Trade. Meanwhile, his interest in the burning question of the day being little more than formal, he turned his attention to a social question in which he had long been interested, and introduced a Bill for the establishment of reformatories for juvenile offenders. Among the many combinations of opposite tastes and tendencies with which Milnes was fond of startling the world, could one more curious be imagined than this-the literary exquisite and the criminal unwashed? But in fact this is only a single instance out of many which could be produced to show that the cynical selfishness he affected was only a mask which hid his real nature; perhaps assumed for the sake of concealing from his left hand what his right hand was doing so well. The proposal, we are told, 'was scoffed at by many politicians of eminence when it was first put forward.' But Milnes was not to be daunted by rebuffs, and 'he persevered with his proposal, until he had the great happiness of seeing reformatories established under the sanction of the law, and of becoming himself the president of the first and greatest of these noble institutions, that at Redhill.' His very genuine sympathy with the poor and the unfortunate, especially when young, is testified to by one of his intimate friends, Miss Nightingale :-

'His brilliancy and talents in tongue or pen—whether political, social, or literary—were inspired chiefly by goodwill towards man; but he had the same voice and manners for the dirty brat as he had for a duchess, the same desire to give pleasure and good. Once, at Redhill, where we were with a party, and the chiefs were explaining to us the system in the court-yard, a mean, stunted, villainous-looking little fellow crept across the yard (quite out of order, and by himself), and stole a dirty paw into Mr. Milnes's hand. Not a word passed; the boy stayed quite quiet and quite contented if he could but touch his benefactor who had placed him there. He was evidently not only his benefactor, but his friend' (vol. ii. p. 7).

Milnes had been called a Liberal-Conservative during the

July

d in

seem

s dis-

n on

osed

o his

owed

rt of

when

vhile,

little

stion

Bill

iders.

and

vorld,

erary

nis is

luced

nly a

r the

d was

at by

ward.

e per-

ess of

f the

st and

unate,

timate

olitical, man

he had

Once,

explain-

ainous-

and by

a word

e could

vidently

ing the

His

first ten years of his parliamentary life. He now became a Conservative-Liberal; but the transposition of the adjective made little, if any, change in his political conduct. He was as insubordinate in the latter position as he had been in the former. He took Lord Palmerston as his leader and chosen friend; but he did not always side with him. In the debates on the Conspiracy Bill, after the attempt of Orsini to assassinate Napoleon III., Milnes spoke and voted against his chief; and on the measure for abolishing the East India Company he was equally indifferent to the claims of party. Gradually, however, he drifted out of party politics altogether; and both in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, which he entered in 1863, it was to measures of a private character. or to measures of social reform, that he gave his attention. He advocated help to Lady Franklin in her expedition to clear up the mystery of her husband's fate; he was in favour of female suffrage; of the abolition of public executions; and -alas! that we should have to record it -he led the infamous agitation for marriage with a deceased wife's sister. At the same time he cordially supported the Liberal party on all great occasions. Speaking of the abortive Reform Bill of 1866, Mr. Reid remarks:-

'Houghton held strongly to the Liberal side throughout the movement, and again afforded proof of the fact that his elevation to the House of Lords had strengthened, rather than weakened, his faith in the people and in popular institutions. Early in April he presided at one of the great popular meetings in favour of Reform. The scene of the meeting was the Cloth Hall at Leeds-a spot famous in the political history of the West Riding-and Lord Houghton's speech was as advanced in tone as the most thoroughgoing Reformer could have wished it to be. He was, indeed, one of the very few peers who took an open and pronounced part in the agitation of the year' (vol. ii. p. 151).

This is only one instance, out of many that could be adduced. It would be interesting to know what he would have thought of some of the later developments of his party. It is almost needless to say that he never regarded Lord Beaconsfield as a serious politician. On the eve of his return from Berlin in 1878, he writes: 'I hope to be in my place on Thursday, to see the reception of the Great Adventurer. Whether from knowing him so well, or from the sarcastic temperament of old age, the whole thing looks to me like a comedy, with as much relation to serious politics as Punch to real life.' At the same time he had not been a thorough supporter of Mr. Gladstone's agitation against the Turks, and

XUM

S

11

to

t

h

I

ai

re

re

he

ju

ne

po

ne

ch

po

ev

th

his

di

ha

he had warned that statesman so far back as 1871, that 'a demon, not of demagoguism, but of demophilism, is tempting you sorely.'

Advancing years and disappointed hopes caused no abatement in his interest in foreign affairs. While Lord Palmerston was in office he continued to act as a sort of envoy, to make observations that might be of use at home; but afterwards he travelled for his own private information. The events of 1848 were specially interesting to him; and at the close of that year he produced what Mr. Reid well describes as 'a striking and instructive' pamphlet, entitled A Letter to the Marguis of Lansdowne. The author reviews the events of the year, and supports the thesis that 'the Liberals of the Continent had not proved themselves unworthy of the sympathy of England.' We have no room for an analysis of this masterly work, but we cannot refrain from quoting one remarkable passage in which he foreshadows French intervention in Italy. After describing measures by which Austria intended to make the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom a second Poland, he proceeds:-

'And France, whatever be her adventures in government, will not easily have so dulled her imagination or quelled her enthusiasm as to be unmoved by appeals to the deeds of Marengo and Lodi, and to suffer an expiring nation at her very door to cry in vain for help and protection, not against the restraints of an orderly authority, but against fierce invaders intent upon her absolute destruction' (vol. i. p. 413).

This pamphlet made a great sensation. In England it was received, for the most part, with dislike and apprehension. Carlyle was almost alone in praising it. 'Tell him,' he said, 'it is the greatest thing he has yet done; earnest and grave, written in a large, tolerant, kind-hearted spirit, and, as far as I can see, saying all that is to be said on that matter.' But the strongest proof of the power of the pamphlet is the fact that the Austrians stopped the writer on the Hungarian frontier when travelling with his wife in 1851, as a person who could not breathe that revolutionary atmosphere without danger to the empire. In his later years foreign travel became almost a necessity to Lord Houghton; and as he had then fewer ties to bind him to England, his absences were more frequent and more prolonged. He travelled in France -no longer as an envoy-but to be the guest of Guizot and De Tocqueville; he was the friend of the accomplished Queen of Holland; he represented the Geographical Society at the opening of the Suez Canal; he made a triumphal progress

at 'a

pting

bate-

erston

make wards

nts of

se of as 'a

to the nts of

of the

symof this

ne re-

inter-

which

gdom

at, will

usiasm Lodi. in for

hority,

i' (vol.

and it rehen-

l him. st and

nd, as

atter.' is the

garian

person

ithout

travel

ne had

s were

France

ot and

Queen

at the

ogress

through the United States; and only three years before his death he went again to Egypt and Greece.

Throughout his life Milnes approached public events with a singular sobriety of judgment. He was never led away by popular clamour, but formed his opinions, on principle, after mature deliberation. It is almost needless to add that he generally found himself on the unpopular side. When England went mad over the Crimean war, Milnes wrote calmly: 'For my own part I like neither of the combatants, though I prefer a feeble and superannuated despotism as less noxious to mankind than one young and vigorous, and assisted by the appliances of modern intelligence.' During the American civil war, he 'broke away from his own class, and ranged himself on the side of the friends of the North, with an earnestness not inferior to that of Mr. Bright and Mr. Forster.' Mr. Reid tells us that this conduct won for Milnes that popularity with the masses, especially in Yorkshire and Lancashire, which all his previous efforts had failed to obtain, and that he found himself, to his great surprise, one of the popular idols. In 1870, again, he was on the unpopular side: 'I am Prussian to the backbone,' he wrote, 'which is a pure homage to principle, as they are the least agreeable people in the

We have been at pains to set forth Milnes's political acts and convictions in some detail, because he has been frequently represented as a gay farceur, who took up politics as a pas-It is not, however, as a politician that he will be remembered, but as a man of letters. In his younger days he achieved distinction as a writer of verse, and Landor hailed him as 'the greatest poet now living in England.' This judgment may nowadays provoke a smile; but, though it is not to be expected that his poems will recover their former popularity, they hardly deserve to have fallen into complete neglect. As Mr. Reid says :-

'A great singer he may not have been; a sweet singer with a charm of his own he undoubtedly was; nor did his charm consist alone in the melody of which he was a master. In many of his poems real poetic thought is linked with musical words; whilst in everything that he wrote, whether in verse or in prose, one may discern the brightest characteristics of the man himself: the catholicity of his spirit; the tenderness of his sympathy with weakness, suffering, mortal frailty in all its forms; the ardour of his faith in something that should break down the artificial barriers by which classes are divided, and bring into the lives of all a measure of that light and happiness which he relished so highly for himself' (vol. ii. p. 438).

n

C

W

h

0

d

fc

th

CI

n

to

p

ea

m

m

W

tr

po

he

in

th

al

fri

hi

15

wl

sa

TI

to

For his prose works, or at least for some of them, we predict a very different fate. We do not like even to think of an age that will refuse to admire the charming style, the real dramatic power, the exquisite tact, and the fine taste which distinguish his Life of Keats, and his Monographs, to which we have already alluded. Other essays, probably of equal merit, lie scattered in Reviews and Magazines. hope that before long we may see the best of these collected together. Such a series, which would cover a period of nearly sixty years, would form a most important chapter in the

history of English literature.

Besides his reputation as a writer, Milnes occupied an unique position towards the world of letters, which it is not quite easy to define. It is not enough to say that he was a Mæcenas, though he knew and entertained the whole literary community both in London and at Fryston—a house which, as Thackeray said, 'combined all the graces of the château and the tavern;' or that he was always ready to lend a helping hand to those in distress, though he spent a fortune in generously and delicately assisting others. His peculiar characteristics were a rare gift in detecting merit, and an untiring energy in bringing it out, and setting it in a position where it could bloom and flourish and be recognized by other people. In effecting this he spared no pains, and shrank from no annoyance. Often, indeed, he must have risked his own popularity by his importunity for favours to be conferred on Mr. Reid describes at length the amusing scene between him and Sir Robert Peel, when he solicited and obtained pensions for Tennyson and Sheridan Knowles, of neither of whom the Minister had ever heard; and he claims also for Milnes the credit of having been the first, or nearly the first, to bring into prominent recognition the merits of Forster. He possessed, too, in a very high degree, the gift of sympathy, and, as a consequence, of influence. 'Ever since I knew you,' said his friend Macarthy, 'you have been the chief person in my life; a friend and brother and confessorthe end and aim of all my actions and hopes;' and Robert Browning, in a long and most interesting letter, written to ask Milnes for the post of Minister at Rome, admits that his own interest in Italy was due in the first instance to Milnes's influence. 'One gets excited,' he says, 'at least here on the spot, by this tiptoe strained expectation of poor dear Italy, and yet, if I had not known you, I believe I should have looked on with the other bystanders.' We have said that he was charitable; but to say this is to give an imperfect idea of the

pre-

c of

the

aste

s, to

y of We

cted

arly

the

l an

not

as a

rary

hich,

teau

nd a

tune

uliar

d an

ition

other

from

own

ed on

scene

es, of

laims

early

its of

e gift

since

n the

sor-

obert

ten to

at his

lnes's

n the

Italy,

ooked

e was

of the

efforts he would make for literary men in difficulties. When Hood was in distress he found that he 'preferred to receive assistance in the shape of gratuitous literary work for his magazine rather than in money.' Milnes not only contributed himself, but 'canvassed right and left among his friends for contributions.' Nor was his help confined to the person whose work he valued. 'The interest and friendship which the genius had aroused, says Mr. Reid, was extended to his or her friends and connexions. Many a widow and many an orphan had occasion to be thankful that the husband or father had during his lifetime excited the admiration of Milnes. Years after the death of Charlotte Brontë we find him trying to smooth the path of her father, and to secure preferment in the Church for her husband.' This is only one instance out of many Again, he seemed to regard his that might be adduced. critical faculty as a trust for the benefit of others, and was never more congenially employed than in drawing attention to some young poet who had no influential friends. In proof of this we will only refer our readers to the touching story of poor David Gray, whom he nursed with almost feminine tenderness, and whose poem, The Luggie, he edited; and to his early recognition of the genius of Mr. Swinburne, to whose merits he drew attention by an article in the Edinburgh Review. In close connexion with this kind help to men of whom he knew little or nothing may be mentioned his interest in the Newspaper Press Fund. The formation of such a fund was strenuously resisted, we are told, by the most influential members of the Press; but Milnes, from the first, brought the whole weight of his social influence to its support, and contributed, more than any other man, to its permanent and successful establishment.

Of Milnes's religious opinions it is difficult to give any positive account. His family had been Unitarian; at college he became an Evangelical; soon afterwards he fell under the influence of Irving, whom he proclaimed to be 'the apostle of the age.' Then, during his residence in Italy, as we have already mentioned, he chose Dr. Wiseman for his intimate friend, and the higher Roman Catholic clergy had hopes of his conversion. 'Mezzofanti,' wrote one of his friends in 1832, 'is full of hopes that you will return to the bosom of hom Carlyle calls "the slain mother." But, during this same period, while passing through what he calls 'the twilight of his mind,' he was the friend of Sterling and Maurice and Thirlwall, under whose influence he was hardly likely to submit to an infallible Church. He himself said that he was pre-

0

10

as

th

he

vented from joining the Church of Rome by the uprising of a Catholic school in the Church of England. To this movement, as we have seen, he was deeply attached, and both spoke and wrote in its defence: a fact which alone would entitle him to honourable mention in these pages. In one of his commonplace books he called himself a Pusevite sceptic; sometimes he said he was a crypto-Catholic, and to the last he never entirely shook off the impressions of his youth. But Mr. Reid is probably right in describing him as 'a tolerant, liberal-minded man, apt to look at religion from many different points of view.' We are not aware that he ever took part in any directly religious movement, or ever declared his allegiance to the Church of England except as a political organization. Partly from love of paradox, partly from his habit of looking round a question rather than directly at it, he would have had something to say in defence of almost any system of religion, while his unfeigned charity would induce him to adopt that which recognized most fully the claims of suffering humanity.

Lord Houghton died at Vichy, August 11, 1885. He had been in failing health for some time, but the end was sudden and unexpected. Only a few hours before it came he had been entertaining a mixed company at the table d'hôte by the brilliancy and variety of his conversation. It might almost be said that he died, as he had lived, in society.

In the preceding pages we have tried to eliminate what we believe to have been the real Milnes from a cloud of misrepresentations and erroneous judgments-for both of which, it must be remembered, he was himself directly responsible. We leave to our readers the task of passing sentence on a singularly amiable, if eccentric, personality. Some opinions expressed by those who understood him and valued him will appropriately close this article. When he was young his friends recognized in him what Dr. Johnson would have called the potentiality of greatness, though they doubted whether he would have sufficient steadiness of purpose to achieve it. 'Your gay and airy mind,' wrote Tennyson in 1833, 'must have caught as many colours from the landscape you moved through as a flying soap-bubble—a comparison truly somewhat irreverent, yet I meant it not as such.' 'I think you are near something very glorious,' said Stafford O'Brien, 'but you will never reach it.' Mr. Aubrey de Vere decided that 'he had not much solid ambition. The highlands of life were not what interested him much; its mountains cast their shadows too far and drew down too many clouds.' But, if Milnes's well-wishers were compelled to abandon their hopes of any great distinction for their friend, they recognized, with one accord, his charity and

re

g of a

move-

both ld en-

of his

eptic; ast he

lerant,

fferent

part in

giance

cation.

oking

ve had

ligion,

t that

anity.

e had

udden

e had *ôte* by might

hat we

repreich, it

nsible.

e on a

inions

m will

friends

he po-

would

ur gay

ght as

flying

, yet I

g very

ach it.'

solid

erested

d drew

s were

ion for

ty and

his sincerity. If they did not admire him, they loved him. 'You are on the whole a good man,' said Carlyle, 'though with terrible perversities.' Forster declared that he had 'many friends who would be kind to him in distress, but only one who would be equally kind to him in disgrace.' A distinguished German said of him, 'Is it possible that an Englishman can be so loveable?' and Mr. Sumner described him as 'a member of Parliament, a poet and a man of fashion, a Tory who does not forget the people, and a man of fashion with sensibilities, love of virtue and merit among the simple, the poor, and the lowly.' Lastly, let us cite his own whimsical character of himself, which, though expressed in the language of paradox, is probably, in the main, nearer to the truth than one drawn by any critic could be:—

'He was a man of no common imaginative perceptions, who never gave his full conviction to anything but the closest reasoning; of acute sensibilities, who always distrusted the affections; of ideal aspirations and sensual habits; of the most cheerful manners and of the gloomiest philosophy. He hoped little and believed little, but he rarely despaired and never valued unbelief, except as leading to some larger truth and purer conviction' (vol. ii. p. 491).

ART. IX.—THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

I. Facsimile of the Original Manuscript of the Book of Common Prayer signed by Convocation, December 20th, 1661, and attached to the Act of Uniformity, 1662 (13 & 14 Charles 2. Cap. 4.) Dedicated by special permission to Her Majesty the Queen. (1891.)

2. Facsimile of the Black Letter Prayer Book containing Manuscript alterations and additions made in the year 1661, out of which was fairly written' The Book of Common Prayer, subscribed Dec. 20, A.D. 1661, by the Convocation of Canterbury and York, and annexed to the Act of Uniformity 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 4, A.D. 1662. Photo-zincographed by the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton (Major-General Sir Henry James, R.E., F.R.S., &c., Director-General), and published for the Royal Commission on Ritual by authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. (1871.)

FOR English churchmen there is an undying interest in all that relates to the history of their Book of Common Prayer and the narrow escapes it has run since its first composition in

1549. It cannot, indeed, be said in any true sense to be the same Prayer Book with either the First or Second Prayer Book of the reign of Edward VI., nor, again, with those of Elizabeth, James I. or Charles I., during the two former of which reigns material alterations and additions were made. Nevertheless, upon the whole, the same type of service has been for the most part preserved, though probably no one, of whatever party in the Church of England, or of whatever opinions, would avow his acceptance of Archbishop Lawrence's dictum that 'the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted were manifestly Lutheran, and in conformity with them was our Liturgy drawn up;'1 or, again, that our Reformation was a movement completed in the reign of Edward VI., 'without suffering any subsequent alteration of importance.' So far from the Prayer Book of 1662 being a true representative of the teaching conveyed in that of 1552, it would be nearer the truth to describe it as indicating some return to the principles of the First book of 1549; and much to be regretted as some churchmen of our day have felt it that at the accession of Elizabeth the preference was given to the Second over the First book of the preceding reign, we are ourselves of opinion that it was a most fortunate circumstance, inasmuch as, had the new book been framed after the model of 1549, Catholic doctrine would have been toned down to meet Protestant prejudices, whereas, as it happens, the expressions of the Second Prayer Book were then accommodated to Catholic belief, and the first upward step was taken from the degraded state in which the Church and her Prayer Book were left at the death of Edward VI. And thus we are enabled to date the beginnings of the recovery from the principles of the Reformation with the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth; beginnings, indeed, slight and scarcely perceptible, but which were destined to bear fruit at the Hampton Court Conference in the reign of James I., and eventually to result in the Prayer Book which is due to the divines of the Savoy Conference. Thus there has been a consistent development in one direction, and that in direct reversal of the process which was going on all through the reign of Edward VI.

It is wonderful to think how the knowledge of Church matters in general, and of the Prayer Book in particular, has been acquired by churchmen in little less than a century from the time when the celebrated Bampton Lectures which we have referred to were preached before the University by the Reis is i

189

sim nui and wai pul of i mis issu Coi sion boo of. the bee froi bur per cen was Thi disc Dea An to Roy hav bey wor Pra trus ocu com with the dire the

min

but

valu

¹ First Bampton Lecture, p. 25.

1891

July e the Book Elizawhich everen for tever nions, ictum conwith t our gn of on of ing a 1552, some much felt it

tance, model wn to se exodated from Book re are e prinof the

ven to

ve are

arcely at the l., and to the een a direct

gh the

Church ar, has y from ich we by the Regius Professor of Hebrew of that day. Still more wonderful is it to think of the profound ignorance which characterized clergy and laity alike in the early years of the present century.

During the last half-century reprints of Edward's Prayer Books have followed each other in rapid succession, and simultaneously with them there has appeared a considerable number of works specially giving an account of their history and composition. And it seemed as if nothing could be wanting to the further elucidation of the subject after the publication of the Facsimile of the Black Letter Prayer Book of 1636, with all the changes introduced by the Savoy Commissioners in the margins and between the lines. This was issued just twenty years ago, and published for the Royal Commission on Ritual by authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. The preface to this book gave a full and particular account of the discovery of the MS. Prayer Book of 1662, originally attached to the Act of Uniformity of 14 Car. II. cap. 4, which had been missing from the year 1819, having become detached from the Act. It was thought possible that it had been burnt, or at least that its discovery was quite hopeless; but permission had been given by Archbishop Moore, nearly a century ago, to use his name for procuring a collation which was partly made and was believed to be in existence in 1845. This collation is now no longer of value, for the original was discovered in 1867, after a diligent search made by the late Dean Stanley, and both the Black Letter Book and the Annexed Book were allowed, by order of the House of Lords, to be taken to the Jerusalem Chamber for the use of the Royal Commission on Ritual. These books, indeed, could not have supplied the commissioners with much information beyond what they might have ascertained from most of the works which professed to give the history of the English Prayer Book, or which, if they should have been unwilling to trust authorities, or preferred judging for themselves from ocular demonstration, they could not have gathered from a comparison of one of the Prayer Books of Elizabeth's time with another of 1662, or of any later date; but it possessed the great advantage of exhibiting both texts at once, and directing attention to every addition, omission, or alteration in the easiest possible way. It also probably represented some minor changes of little importance, of which no writer had thought it worth while to give any account. We will give but one instance—and it certainly is a remarkable one—of the value of having some of these changes impressed upon the

its

ma

thi

nea

of

exi

effe

not

Mu

pro

Par

cat

had

in t

giv

pro

Pra

ter

bef

An

froi

bee

WOI

pub

on

has

ant

cert

Par

Boo

he o

coll

Boo

less

abo

pre

In

end

alre

case

how

pen

muc

mind by their being oculis subjecta fidelibus. All students of the history of the Prayer Book know of the important alterations in the words used at the consecration of a bishop, which were made in 1661. But, whatever view may be taken of the intention of the words which is in thee by imposition of hands, the words when seen in print, thus,

given this our which is in thee, by imposition of hands

will impress anyone who sees them much more forcibly than by reading the fact recorded any number of times.

At any rate it will be impressed indelibly on the memory that the divines of the Savoy Conference were careful to destroy any lingering suspicion that at the consecration of a bishop the elect was only put in mind to stir up the grace of God which had been given at some previous time. No amount of comparison, even in parallel columns, would answer the purpose so well. And we even think it would pay some publisher well if he would reprint an imitation of this facsimile book in modern type, with the changes introduced in their proper places. We are sure that candidates for Holy Orders getting up their Prayer Book for an examination would be saved an infinite deal of trouble by such an arrangement.

After what we have said it might have been thought superfluous to issue any more accounts or histories of the compilation of the Prayer Book, inasmuch as it has not been subjected to any alteration since that time, with the single exception of a new 'Calendar of Daily Lessons.' Yet experience has shown the contrary, and Mr. Parker's two valuable publications of the year 1877 have proved that there was yet a great deal more that might be said on the subject. The first of these volumes has supplied us, not only with the exact text of every authorized edition of the Prayer-Book, under the title The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. Compared with the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, but has also given the variations, whether undesigned or intentional, that appear sometimes even in the same edition, and more often in different editions printed at different times and in different sizes. The second, which followed it in the same year at a very short interval, was entitled, An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, and presents such an elaborate and complete account of the mode in which the Prayer Book reached

dents rtant shop, taken on of

July

than

emory to den of a grace . No would would ion of introlidates aminaich an

nought e comt been single expealuable re was subject. y with Prayerard VI. ommon esigned edition, it times t in the ntroduc-Book of d com-

reached

its present state, that again it must have been thought by many that nothing more remained to be done in reference to this subject. This work also contained an examination of nearly all the editions that had been printed in the reigns of Elizabeth and her two successors-most of which are extremely scarce—many of them containing unauthorized variations, such as minister for priest, introduced by the efforts of the Puritan party. This catalogue is nearly, though not quite, complete, there having since been found in private collections a few copies which did not then exist in the British Museum or other large public libraries; and it is scarcely probable that every edition has yet been discovered. Mr. Parker had, further, the advantage of coming after the publication of the photozincographed book, which he must have had at his elbow nearly all the time in which he was engaged in the composition of his second volume. Accordingly he has given a detailed account both of the book itself and of the processes by which all the alterations of the preceding Prayer Books were effected. And now, after another interval of fourteen years, we have the beautiful volume that is before us, the book that is technically known as 'The Annexed Book,' of which 750 copies have been lithographed from separate photograms of each page. As all these had been subscribed for, we were a little surprised at finding the work advertised among the Christian Knowledge Society's publications. But no doubt the society has rightly calculated on the probability of the book soon becoming scarce, and has provided a good number of the 750 copies to supply an anticipated demand from its members, as the work will certainly never again be produced in like fashion. Parker had also seen, and has described, 'The Annexed Book,' whose title is at the head of this article; but of course he could not have had the same facilities for comparing and collating this book as he enjoyed as regards the Black Letter Book, from which it is presumed to have been copied. Much less, therefore, has been said by him about this book than about either the 'Convocation Book,' as it is called, or the previously prepared copies written by Sancroft and by Cosin. In what we have to say about the Annexed Book we shall endeavour as much as possible to avoid traversing the ground already occupied by Mr. Parker, though we may in certain cases have to repeat what he has already said. In all cases, however, our observations are the result of an entirely independent investigation, and we shall confine our remarks as much as possible to instituting a comparison, first, between

th

al

th

fre

ar

th

M

A

ap

fre

pa

of

jec

the

of

Th

Bla

and

ma

ori

and

bef

has

Off

be

eve

onl

mo

risi

foll

S

the Annexed Book and that from which it was presumed to be a copy; and, secondly, in noticing the variations of our present Prayer Book from the Annexed Book, which it ought

to represent exactly.

We must first, however, give some description of the book It is a beautifully-written manuscript of an ordinary folio size, consisting of 554 pages, at the end of which are subscribed the autographs of the bishops and members of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, followed by a few of those of the Northern Province, the last two leaves representing a facsimile of the cover of the book, with the holes for the strings by which it was fastened to the Act of Uniformity. It was signed by all the surviving bishops of the Province of Canterbury, with the single exception of Brian Duppa, Bishop of Winchester, who as Bishop of Salisbury had been one of the chief movers in the attempt to keep up the succession of bishops during the year preceding the Restoration; and the absence of whose signature is quite unaccountable. After the bishops come the members of the Lower House of Convocation, headed by the prolocutor, Henry Fern, Dean of Ely, followed by some distinguished names, amongst which are those of John Barwick, Dean of St. Paul's, John Fell, Dean of Christ Church, and John Pearson, at that time Archdeacon of Surrey, together with others, some of whom afterwards were promoted to bishoprics. On the last page we have the Archbishop of York with his two suffragans of Durham and Carlisle, the name of the Bishop of Sodor and Man being absent, together with only six members of the Lower House, four of whom, viz. Fern and Barwick, and Hitch, Archdeacon of Leicester, and Lloyd, who had previously signed as Proctor for St. Asaph, of the Province of Canterbury. Considering the haste in which the work is known to have been executed, it is singularly accurate and free from ordinary blunders of writing; but there are several instances where corrections of wrong writing have been neatly made, and would not be noticed except by a person examining it for the purpose of finding them; and there are not a few mistakes of omission or addition or alteration which it was impossible to conceal. There are also a few mistakes which have been left by accident uncorrected, e.g. the word santuary for sanctuary in the 68th Psalm, to which may perhaps be added a few others.

No one, however, can have compared the two books with any care without discovering that upon the whole there is no variation of any importance, excepting in the Psalms, yet

We

sumed of our ought

July

e book dinary ch are of the d by a leaves ith the Act of nops of tion of Salisto keep ing the ite unof the locutor, guished Dean of d John er with hoprics. vith his Bishop nly six ern and vd, who Province work is ate and e several n neatly examinre not a which it mistakes he word

perhaps oks with ere is no lms, yet that the one was not copied throughout—if, indeed, it was at all in any part transcribed from the other. This is proved by the number of obliterated words and sentences where the original writing can still be read, and must have been derived from a different copy. Thus, in the direction for priests and deacons to say the Office daily, the erased reading is when conveniently they may, and there is nothing resembling this in any preceding Book of Common Prayer; neither, as Mr. Parker tells us, in either Sancroft's or Cosin's transcripts. As regards other erasures no doubt they somewhat spoil the appearance of these otherwise beautiful pages, but they are significant as indicating more variety of opinion and greater freedom of debate among the Revisers than is otherwise known to have existed.

Though the book is really a beautiful specimen of the best handwriting of the period, it cannot be denied that many pages have been greatly disfigured by the obliterations, some of which are of readings deliberately adopted and then rejected. The most remarkable of these in the early part of the work are the erasures which occur on the twelve pages of the Calendar of Lessons for the months of the year. These erasures occur in precisely the same manner in the Black Letter copy which is supposed to be its exemplar, and of course it may be that this alteration was simultaneously made in the two copies. In both these books there had been originally written and afterwards erased the times of sunset and sunrise for each month. It had been a common practice before the Reformation to place these in a calendar, and it has before now helped to ascertain the place to which the Office Book belonged, as the latitude could approximately be judged of by the length of the day. Such insertions, however, were practically useless, because they could be correct only for one particular latitude and only for one day in the month for which they were intended to supply the times of rising and setting. The form in which they appear is as follows, taken from the Convocation Book:

¶ April hath xxx dayes.

¶ The Moon hath xxix.

We have printed this just as it is, with the mistake of the hours, which was inadvertently copied from the next leaf and

gives the times of sunrise and sunset for June instead of April. And all these appear for every month erased in both books. But they are not so obliterated but that in most cases they can easily be read. And it is clear that in this month, as well as in some others where the printing was more correct, there are variations between the two copies. In the case of the Black Letter Book they are very easy to read, and in almost every case they are ludicrously mistaken, it being very difficult in some cases to see how the mistakes could have arisen. They are much more difficult to make out in the Annexed Book, but it can at any rate safely be pronounced that they differ so materially as to prove that they are entirely independent of them, being generally more correct, though very roughly calculated, for whatever latitude they may have been intended to serve.

Another instance in which the Annexed Book offers a suggestion which does not appear in the Convocation Book occurs in the rubric which directs the priest to stand after the Lord's Prayer which follows the Creed. Here it had been written 'and so continuing to the end of the service' both in the Morning and Evening Service, but these words-of unknown origin-were afterwards erased and at the same time the words 'all kneeling' were added to the end of the rubric before the Collects. The words so erased and added, respectively, seem to us to furnish irrefutable evidence that according to our present Prayer Book both priest and people are alike to kneel at the Collects. In arguments on this subject it is too often forgotten that the priest is brought upon his knees by the same general direction-viz. 'all kneeling'-both at the General Confession and at the end of the Creed, before the 'Lesser Litany.' It is quite of late years that the clergy, in some of the more advanced churches, have refrained from obeying the explicit direction of the Prayer Book conveyed in the words 'all kneeling.'1

The significant addition of the words and rebellion in the Litany of 1662 was an afterthought, as is shown by their having been added over the line in the Annexed Book, which here again could not have been transcribed from the Black Letter Book after the correction had been made. The intro-

ref no us for

in

fere

18

di

Bo

Bl

had the Bib won the in b The the exp in it has to b

twen whic reade last 1 the p other full o and o the o full o the tv regard missio stand of the which

state o

sundry the Ca

XUM

¹ For a full discussion of this subject see letters in the Guardian by 'Laicus,' 'Churchman,' and others (June 10, 17, 24, July 2 and 9, 1801). Those who advocate the standing at the Collects are for ever quoting Cosin's dictum, 'The Priest is not appointed to kneel down afterwards at the Collects.' They forget, or at least omit, to add that Cosin penned that 'Note' more than twenty years before the present Prayer Book—and with it the added words 'All kneeling'—came into existence. Cosin's dictum ceases to be true.

ead of n both t cases month, orrect, case of and in g very d have in the ounced entirely

though

July

y have offers a n Book fter the d been h in the nknown e words fore the ly, seem to our to kneel oo often by the General 'Lesser some of ying the he words

on in the by their bk, which he Black the introuardian by d 9, 1891). rer quoting terwards at sin penned Book—and e. Cosin's duction of the word *kindly* before *weather* in the 'Prayer for Fair Weather' is another instance showing that the Annexed Book was not entirely copied out after the final revision of the Black Letter Book, for it is obliterated in both books.

For other instances of this kind we must be content to refer to Mr. Parker's elaborate analysis of the Offices. We now go on to mention such matters as have been noticed by us in the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Annexed Book,

for these have been omitted by Mr. Parker.

It had never been the practice in preceding Prayer Books, in printing passages from the Bible, to distinguish by a difference of type words introduced to complete the sense, which had no representative in the original language, as had been the almost universal custom from the earliest times in the Bibles themselves. Now, in the Gospels which begin with words such as Jesus said or Jesus said to his disciples, and the like, these words are written in a large type and included in brackets to mark the fact that they are not in the Bible. There can therefore be no doubt that this was intended by the compilers as a direction to the printer to follow, and such expressions ought to appear in our Books of Common Prayer in italics, though we believe there is no instance in which this has been observed. And here is a point which we think ought to be attended to in future editions. This point will be again noticed when we come to speak of the Psalms.

The Communion Service in the Annexed Book occupies twenty-three pages, and here we have not noticed any mistake which could be attributed to the scribe. Of course every reader knows how much change was introduced here at the last revision. No one, therefore, would be surprised at seeing the pages of the Black Letter Book full of interlineations and other marginal alterations. In fact this part of the book is full of changes, some of which eventually stood their ground, and others were again erased altogether, and altered back to the original, or else were changed again. Every page here is full of attempted or effected alterations, and a comparison of the two books alone would show what difference of opinion as regards certain matters must have existed amongst the commissioners. The readings which were meant eventually to stand are in both books the same, with the single exception of the first rubric at the end of the service, where the words which had been printed between the brackets (for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth) were altered by sundry erasures and interlineations into (for the good state of the Catholic Church of Christ), whereas the Annexed Book

VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

has the latter form written and then altered back into the other and older form, as it is represented in our present Prayer Book. There is the same alteration in the heading of the Prayer for the Church in both books, the Black Letter Book having gone through two processes of change, the Annexed Book only one, both of them here eventually agreeing in the form at present adopted. This, therefore, is the reading which ought to stand, but the alterations at least show what a struggle there was before the final reading was accepted. And here again it is somewhat beside our point, but it seems worth recording, that the reading of the Convocation Book as against the Annexed Book was adopted in most of the earlier printed editions of the Prayer Book, and held its ground for at least 150 years. We are unable to say exactly the year in which this reading was finally discontinued.

This, however, is not the only point in the comparison of the two books which indicates a struggle between two parties. It is probable, we think, that the difference of opinion was one not of any principle, but as to the policy or expediency of introducing changes which might be unacceptable to some. We do not think the Savoy Commissioners can be accused of an undue desire to conciliate the Puritan party, but some of them may have been influenced by the fear of alienating large numbers of the laity who had so long been under Pres-

byterian and Independent influences.

The changes and counter-changes made in this Office are many, and both books exhibit signs of their having been made at the last moment simultaneously. The first shows the difficulty experienced in adapting a rubric to the circumstances in which the Revisers found themselves as regards the different position of the altar or communion-table. At first it had been agreed that the table should stand 'in the most convenient place in the upper end of the chancel,' which words appear in both books, but in both were subsequently altered into the old form, which is still found as it was in the Elizabethan book.

The same difficulty accounts for the adoption in both books of the word part as substituted for side, and its subsequent change into side. No such reason, however, will account for the introduction and subsequent erasure of the words who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, in the enunciation of the First Command-

ment.

There are a few other erased rubrics, or portions of rubrics, all of which have been noticed by Mr. Parker. They

b

R

tl

rı

Ca

us

al

to

Bo

We

the

sai

pa

are

eems

Book

f the

round

v the

on of

arties.

n was

liency

some.

cused

some

nating

Pres-

ice are

been

shows

ircum-

egards

e. At

in the

nancel,

d as it

n both

subse-

will ac-

of the

t of the

nmand-

ions of

They

the are, as he says, puzzling, but are not of any importance. esent noticeable, however, that the insertion of the words in the first ng of exhortation, 'Therefore, if any of you be a blasphemer,' down to 'both of body and soul,' must have been an afterthought, etter Anfor in both books they are inserted in the margin in the same eeing handwriting. Both books, also, show the unsuccessful attempt ding to introduce the words in full assurance of faith, instead of with what faith in the Short Address to the Communicants. pted.

In the Prayer of Humble Access it is possible that the misplacement of the words and soules after our sinful bodies, instead of and our soules before washed may be a blunder of the scribe, and afterwards corrected. If so, it is the only mistake made by him in this Office, unless the insertion of the word made before partakers in the Consecration Prayer is to be considered a mere error of writing; and it may be noticed that the word is only doubtfully erased. The only other erasure in the Office is that of the word consecrated, which certainly never could have got in by accident in the rubric, 'And when he delivereth the consecrated bread.' Upon the whole it is clear that there was an attempt to bring things up to a more definitely Catholic standard than was actually reached.

There only remains to be noticed the subsequent addition of a note in Sancroft's hand to the Communion Office in both these books. It has usually been designated the Black Rubric. It, of course, cannot be said to belong to the text of the Prayer Book, and it does not come under the head of a rubric, containing as it does no directions how to act, but consisting only of the opinion of the writer, and so seems scarcely to form a part of the Prayer Book at all, and if so can scarcely be considered as binding all Churchmen who accept the Prayer Book to the particular form of expression used. If it had been intended as a rubric it ought to have been written in the same somewhat larger character in which all the rubrics of the book are written, and which was meant to correspond to the italic character of our modern Prayer Books. It seems somewhat like a provision for the case of weak brethren, much of the same nature as the note appended to the Office for Baptism, to take away all scruple concerning the use of the sign of the cross, which is written just in the same way and in the same hand.

As regards the erasures and a few accidental mistakes made by the scribe in the Occasional Offices, there is no particular feature that calls for observation on our part. They are for the most part easily distinguishable, and seem to bear

112

XUM

ti

p

0

b

I

V

b

th

Ca

m

B

B

na

tit

B

T

B

W

tic

out the comments we have already made upon those of the earlier part of the work.

The pages of the two books here present a remarkable contrast. The Convocation Book is full of corrections. In the Annexed Book there are few erasures, and these of slight importance. They scarcely exceed twenty in all the services, and most of these are mere errors of copying, which have been put to rights, and nearly all the rest are such as have been altered from readings which have no sanction in the Black Letter Book, and must therefore have been introduced from some other source.

The last portion of the Annexed Book is occupied by 'The Forme and Manner of Making, Ordeining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,' which fills thirty-six pages. This is for the most part written in a clear hand, and without errors of copying, or erasures, or other corrections. It has to be remarked, however, that in the preface the words or hath had formerly Episcopall Consecration or Ordination are a subsequent addition, filling up the remainder of one line, the last three words being an interlineation. It is a curious fact that in this Office the petition of the Litany runs 'from all false doctrine, schism, and heresy,' instead of heresy, and schism, and it is evident there is here an erasure under which had been written and heresy, the addition of the word schism to the old form not having been thought of at first. In the Black Letter Book the instruction here is to insert the words and schism after and heresie. There are a few other slight variations, as in the use of the word be for are twice in the Litany, following the Black Letter Book where it had not been corrected as it was in the Litany, as used in the Morning Service. Other slight variations seem scarcely worth chronicling, such as the addition of the word may, the omission of the, and perhaps a few others. It must not, however, be forgotten that the oath of the King's Sovereignty is altogether different from that of both these books, which follow precisely the form first introduced in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book of 1559.

And now we proceed to the second part of the task we have set ourselves, viz. the comparison of the Annexed Book with the existing Prayer Book of the Church of England; the average appearance of the pages of which certainly may be said to correspond with tolerable exactness to the exemplar which it ought to follow, though of course the difference in the spelling of words is very considerable, and the minor variations of stops and initial capitals may be counted by hundreds. The

retaining of the original spelling would have been simply absurd, because there is absolutely no uniformity in this respect, a single page presenting such varieties as believe, believe, and believe.

And yet there are some perhaps whose first object, upon seeing a facsimile of the Annexed Book, would be to ascertain for themselves how far our present Prayer Book really corresponds with the exemplar from which it was originally copied, and whether accidentally or intentionally any variations have crept in. Accordingly we proceed to notice this point, and certainly we may say that no important changes have been made. And yet in regard to the smaller matters of stops and initial capitals we think there ought to have been a somewhat closer agreement. In both these points there has been some carelessness in the transcript of the Annexed Book. It is by no means uniformly consistent, especially in the use of capitals, though again it seems to us probable that in many instances there was design in the use of small or capital initials. We shall notice this again presently when we speak of the body of the book as copied, or supposed to be copied, from the Black Letter edition of 1636. But we shall first give some account of the version of the Psalms adopted in the Annexed Book, and almost uniformly followed in Books of Common Prayer as they are printed at the present day. It is at least certain that these were not copied from what is called the Convocation Book, although from the alteration made in the title to the Psalms of the photozincographed copy one might have thought it was intended that the Annexed Book should be transcribed from it.

This title which bears date 1639, whereas the Black Letter Book on its first title has the date 1636, has been altered just as the first title has by the omission of the printer's name. But the title to the Annexed Book omits all notice of the name or the alteration in the first title, and has no separate title to the Psalms. If it ever was intended that the Annexed Book should have its Psalms copied from the Convocation Book, such intention must have been given up by the time the first and only alteration in the Psalms was marked out. This occurs at the 14th Psalm, where, in the Black Letter Book of 1636-9, the three verses from the fifth to the eighth were underscored and placed in brackets to show that they were to be printed in italic character. In this one point there is perfect agreement between the two books, but a comparison of the text adopted throughout exhibits at least 130 variations, some of which are of some importance, though the

XUM

he

uly

In the es, we we the

ed

The ng ges. out to ath

ast hat alse and een old eter ism

as

as her the os a ath t of

we ook the said ch it ling of The

sh

int

pa

th

sic

wi

of

Pr

ed

th

15

Bi

ad

for

pr

th

CO

th

pe

no

ne

he

th

to

an

Th

the

15 Bo

me

for

CO

38

an

mi

lor

greater part consist of changes of which into who and be into are. It is quite evident that they were copied direct from one of the folio editions of Cranmer's Bible. For in no previously published Prayer Book had the headings of the Psalms been printed, such as begin with the 3rd Psalm, which is headed, A Psalm of David when he fled from the face of Absalom his son.' It had not been the custom at first to insert the Psalms at all in the Prayer Book; and to supply the want, an edition of the Bible of Cranmer's version had been printed in a small folio form in the year 1549, which in type and size matches the First Prayer-Book of the reign of Edward VI. And this contained all the headings of the Psalms exactly like the Bibles of larger size which had preceded it, having been printed in the years 1539, 1540, and 1541. This edition Dr. Cotton states to have been copied from that of 1541. is extremely unlikely, as it closely resembles that of April 1540, differing from it, as far as we can judge, chiefly by a few careless omissions or misprints. Of course, therefore, it contains the headings just as these Bibles all do. But so does the Annexed Prayer Book from the 3rd up to the 72nd Psalm inclusive, which is headed 'A Psalm for Solomon,' and concludes with the words 'The words of David the son of Jesse are ended,' just as in the folio editions of Cranmer's Bible. After the Psalms had been copied so far, the mistake was discovered, and the scribe instructed to omit these headings, which he did for the remainder of the Psalms. These headings were afterwards carefully obliterated, if that can be called an obliteration which allows the original writing to be read, as is the case with most of these erasures, which, though neatly done, of course somewhat disfigure the pages of this handsome book. And this disfigurement is further increased by the fact that down to the 68th Psalm inclusive they were numbered in words, thus, The eight and sixtieth Psalm, where in all cases up to this point the words were erased and Roman numerals substituted in their place, and written above the erasure, thus:

LXVIII. eight and sixtieth.

all the subsequent Psalms being headed, not as they now are, Psalm 69, but 'The LXIX Psalm.' Why so much trouble was taken, to no purpose apparently, and to the great disfigurement of the page, it is not easy to say; but it seems as if it were intended that this particular form of heading should be adopted in the copies to be printed from the Authorized form. Again there seems no reason why the catchwords

nto

one

sly

een

led,

his

ms

ion

nall

hes

his

the

een

Dr.

his

pril

few

on-

oes

2nd

and

esse

ble.

dis-

ngs,

ad-

lled

ead,

atly

me

d in

rals

us:

now

ible

dis-

s as

ould

ized

ords

should have been added, as they invariably are, unless it was intended that some copy should be printed exactly page for page with the original. We may observe, also, that down to the 68th Psalm all the verses ending with Selah have been printed just as they are in the folio Bibles of Cranmer's version, and the word Selah afterwards obliterated, thus further disfiguring the pages of the Annexed Book, which is other-

wise quite a pattern of neatness and beauty.

The next question that arises is as to which of the editions of the Great Bible so called was the copy in the Annexed Prayer Book made. It certainly was not copied from the edition printed in 1549 to match the Prayer Book, nor from the properly so called Great Bible issued by Cromwell in 1539, nor again from the first or April edition of Cranmer's Bible of 1540, for in the fourth verse of the 68th Psalm it has adopted the mistaken reading of yea for Jah. It must, therefore, have been taken either from the July edition, which first produced this error, or from some subsequent reprint between that time and November 1541. It is most probable that a copy of the November 1540 was used; but as the sheets of these volumes were very much intermixed, and there is not a perfect agreement with any, this point requires more investigation than we have been able to give it, and it is after all of no great importance. But there is a curious change very neatly made in the 12th verse of the 33rd Psalm which may help to decide which of the later editions of the folio volume the Annexed copy followed. The words that have chosen him to be their inheritance had certainly been written in this verse and have thus been altered :-

he to that hath chosen him to be=his inheritance.

The erased words agree with the edition of 1549, from which they were undoubtedly not copied, differing from that of April 1540, as well as from all previously printed copies of the Prayer Book, including the Black Letter of 1636. What is of much more importance is, that some other undoubted errors have found their way into the Annexed Book and have never been corrected to the present day. The first of these occurs in the 38th Psalm, at verse 10, where both the editions of April 1540 and that of 1549 have the correct reading, 'and the light of mine eyes is gone from me,' whereas the Annexed Book as well as the Convocation Book have altered light into sight, the long letter of the period (f) having been substituted for what so nearly resembles it (l). Another distinct mistake in the

Annexed Book, in which it varies together with the Convocation Book from the right reading, occurs in the 87th Psalm, verse 4, where Behold ye the Philistines also was originally, and ought still to have been, rendered Behold, yea the Philistines also. Here again it is easy to trace the source of the error, the edition of April 1540 having the word yea here as elsewhere spelt yee, which afterwards was changed into ye, the comma between the words Behold and yee being omitted.

There is one variation from most previous editions of the Bible as well as of the Prayer Book which we suppose was deliberately altered. Many versions, including the Bishops' and the earliest issue of Cranmer's Bible, as well as that printed to match the Prayer Book of 1549, have in the 93rd Psalm, verse 4, 'The floods are risen, O Lord, the floods have lift up their noise; the floods lift up their waves.' But the word noise has been altered both in the Black Letter and in the Annexed Book into voice, which has properly been followed by subsequent Prayer Books, and indeed for the most part the word voice is used in Prayer Books of an earlier date.

There are two or three other doubtful renderings which we scarcely like to describe as errors, as we are not sure that they were not intentional renderings. But of these three there can be no doubt. Of the last two we think our present Prayer Books ought to be relieved, for though they occur in the original writing, they are simply of the nature of a misprint, and would have been so called if the work had been printed instead of written. We believe we are the first to notice these. But the other, viz. the substitution of yea for Jah, was discovered at the beginning of the eighteenth century, during the reign of Queen Anne. We cannot say when the first Prayer Book appeared with the proper reading Jah, but we have before us a small Oxford edition of 1697 with the word printed yea, and another Oxford edition of 1708 with Jah. It is scarcely à propos to our present subject, but we cannot forbear remarking that though this blunder was discovered at least as early as the year 1708, and corrected thenceforth in the Oxford Prayer Books, many years elapsed before the correction was adopted in those printed by the King's printer in London, and, later still, editions printed at Cambridge kept to the old mistake. We cannot say the exact year in which it was finally dropped, but we have a 12mo Cambridge Prayer Book before us which is dated 1832 in which this error is committed.

Here then is a case of an admitted mistake of the Annexed Book, which appears also in the Convocation Book,

which fairly can to I another pear

of m

1891

which lead have man sligh The the the . earli mad almo brid insta a rec the . word writt Bool when here, have the f of va read copie The and as to day. the A case other notic alleg and

clude

that

uly

ca-

lm,

ilithe

as

the

was

ops'

that 3rd

ave

ord the

wed

part

hich

sure hree

sent

r in

mis-

been

t to

cen-

say

ding

1697

n of

nder

cor-

years

inted

tions

nnot it we

lated

f the

Book,

which has been allowed to be corrected. We think we may fairly claim that the other two errors, about which there can be no doubt, and which we believe we are the first to point out, should be corrected, and that hereafter the anomalous expression, Behold ye the Philistines may disappear from our Prayer Books, and the poor substitute of sight of mine eyes for light be also done away with for ever.

The instances we have already quoted are all cases in which our modern Prayer Books have wrongly followed the leading of the Annexed Book in copying mistakes. But we have now to notice the few variations between the authorized manuscript and the printed copies. The first of these is a slight change from the word on to in in the 42nd Psalm, verse 10. There can be no doubt that on is the true reading, for it is the reading of the folios and of the Convocation Book and of the Annexed Book, and was followed for some time in the earlier printed Prayer Books. When that change was first made we do not know, but the altered reading has been almost universally adopted. An exception occurs in a Cambridge edition of 1832, where on is printed. Here, too, is an instance in which we should hope there would be for the future a recurrence to the true reading. In the same psalm, verse 6, the Annexed Book has why art thou disquieted, omitting the word so; and this was certainly designed, for so had been written, and was afterwards erased, but our modern Prayer Books mostly have the word. Here, again, is an instance where a recurrence to the old reading seems desirable. And here, too, the 12mo Cambridge edition of 1832 which we have already referred to has the right reading. Lastly, in the first verse of the 50th Psalm there is one other instance of variation in which it is difficult to determine whether the reading of the Annexed Book differs from other preceding copies and from all subsequent reprints by accident or design. The Annexed Book reads the most high for the most mighty; and in this instance we are at a loss to make any suggestion as to which ought to be adopted in the Prayer Books of this day. But we cannot be wrong in giving our opinion that the Annexed Book should be strictly adhered to in every case where it is not demonstrably in error. There is one other point worth noticing in the Psalms. We have already noticed that in the Black Letter printed copy from which it is alleged that the Annexed Book was copied, the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses of the 14th Psalm are underscored and included within square brackets, evidently with the intention that they should be printed in italics; and the Annexed

Book has them written in a different and larger handwriting, and similarly inclosed in brackets, evidently with the same object in view. And this same style of writing and marking off within brackets is continued at intervals throughout the Psalms. Evidently the intention was that all those passages should be specially noted in the printed books, just as in our Authorized Version of the Bible the words which are in any sense additional to the original are now printed in italics to draw attention to the fact that they have been added by the translators to make the meaning more intelligible. Now, anyone who has compared the Authorized with the Prayer Book version of the Psalms will have seen how many additions to the text have been inserted in the latter. Besides the verses already referred to, there are frequent additions of words and sentences, as, e.g., at the end of the 13th Psalm, yea, I will praise the name of the Lord most Highest, which are not to be met with in the Authorized Version. The longest of these additions, next to the three verses already alluded to, is that of the last verse of the 136th Psalm, 'O give thanks unto the Lord of Lords, for His mercy endureth for ever.' All these marked passages are additions of the Septuagint Version which are not in the Hebrew text, and from which they have been translated by St. Jerome in the Vulgate, from which they have found their way into the earlier versions of the Bible, and are printed in the folios of 1540 and 1541 in a different and smaller type, and not in the usual large black-letter. The intention of this variation is evident, for in no preceding Prayer Book had any notice been taken of these differences between the Hebrew original and the Septuagint and Vulgate version, whereas the distinction of handwriting was preserved throughout the Psalms of the Annexed Book; and in one or two instances, in which the scribe had forgotten to change the handwriting in passages of this kind, the error was afterwards repaired, and attention called to it by underlining the words which ought to have been written in the larger type. As regards other points, the readings of the Convocation Book and the Annexed Book seldom differ except in the modernising of the word be into are, and which into who, in which, however, the Annexed Book is far from being consistent; and in the 17th Psalm the word who has evidently, in three different cases, been altered back again into which, and there is the same apparent change in the 47th Psalm, verse 9. This, of course, looks as if there had been more than one supervision of the Psalms after they had been copied, with general instructions to alter which into who.

Oth inse of th copi mer' may Con the e of o corre date them was 1 folios Bible it has be th Greel be his that t copie begin away, the H rized sent s that in righte which date o

1891

known this vo Great in Bible, the sul author from I Book, differen

copy i

We present the An

ting,

ame

king

the

ages

our

any

draw

rans-

vone

Book

ns to

rerses

will

to be

these

s that

to the

these

ersion

have

which

of the

a dif-

letter.

ceding

rences

d Vul-

g was

; and

tten to

error

under-

in the

of the

differ

which

r from

tho has

again

ne 47th

d been

ad been

to who.

Other minor differences consist chiefly of the omission or insertion of little words like the by mistake, or an interchange of the and thy, or, what is more probable, owing to the two copies having been made from a different edition of Cranmer's Bible. And in confirmation of this last hypothesis, we may observe that in the second verse of the 33rd Psalm the Convocation Book has the reading sing psalms unto him as in the edition of 1549, whereas the Annexed Book has the reading of our present Prayer Books, sing praises unto him, which corresponds with the first edition of Cranmer's Bible bearing date April 1540. It is, however, quite certain that neither of them was transcribed from the small folio of 1549, which was probably then, as it is now, much scarcer than the larger folios, which are often spoken of as editions of the Great Bible, as the comparison of this Psalm alone would prove, for it has in verse 12 the strange reading 'that have chosen him to be their inheritance,' which has not the sanction of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, instead of 'that he hath chosen to him to be his inheritance.' And in the same way we may observe that the 37th Psalm proves that they were neither of them copied from the edition of April 1540, which has at the beginning of the 37th verse the words 'and he vanished away, and lo he was gone,' which, however, is sanctioned by the Hebrew, and has virtually been adopted in our Authorized Bible. Here, too, though it forms no part of our present subject, it will not be altogether out of place to notice that in the 29th verse of this Psalm there is a misprint of righteous for unrighteous, which occurs in every Prayer Book which we have seen of all the preceding reigns up to the date of the Black Letter Book of 1636, including even the copy in the Bishops' Bible of 1602, which was used by the translators of the Authorized Version.

We have dwelt so long on the Psalms because so little is known to people in general of the variations that occur in this version, which is in the main the same in Cromwell's Great Bible of 1539, and in the different editions of Cranmer's Bible, which subsequently appeared in print. Before quitting the subject of the Psalms, we may observe that there is no authority at all for numbering the verses of the 119th Psalm from I to 176, all preceding books, including the Convocation Book, which is followed by the Annexed Book, marking the

different portions from verse I to verse 8.

We now proceed to notice a few other points in which our present Prayer Books fail to represent exactly the readings of the Annexed Book. These are all of very slight importance,

and the changes have mostly been introduced in recent times: but the fact that they are so insignificant and so recent is the very reason why they ought never to have been made. For instance, in the direction to find Easter which is at the foot of the Table there is an unnecessary and unauthorized change. There is absolutely no difference in the sense, but instead of the words in our present Prayer Books, which have thus been printed for nearly a century, we ought to have the following:-

When ye have found the Sunday letter in the uppermost line, guide your eve downwards from the same till you come right over against the Prime, and there is showed both what month and what day of the month Easter falleth that year.'

Again, in the sentences at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer the word all has no business to appear in the text blot out mine iniquities. The next variation is in the form of Absolution, where the old form, we beseech Him, had been altered in the Black Letter Book of 1536 first into beseech we Him, and subsequently into let us beseech Him, with a direction in the Evening Service, where these forms were not reprinted, to follow the form of the Morning Prayers. It is curious that in the Annexed Book the first correction of the Black Letter Book had been followed and then erased, and the new form, let us beseech Him, inserted. But it was evidently forgotten when the Evening Service was supervised, and the form still remains there-beseech we Him. But in point of fact early Prayer Books of the seventeenth century were printed with this variation in the Morning and Evening Service, thus strictly following the exemplar, as was also done with regard to the omission of the word all in the preceding sentences. Both these modes had been altered before the commencement of the eighteenth century. As there is little doubt that this was a mere mistake, arising from want of observation, we scruple to recommend the change as being desirable. Of course its only importance is as regards the point whether it is desirable or not to reproduce an exact reprint of the Annexed Book. We should like, at least, to see a copy of the Annexed Book published with all its defects and changes, and we think such a work might be advantageously added to the other Prayer Books published in Messrs, Griffith and Farran's 'Theological Series.' The book would be sure of a large sale, as of the many who would like to judge for themselves of the mode in which the Prayer Book of 1662 was produced few could afford the price at which the facsimile is published. There is no other variation

in th Colle recita at, in, in or psalm dicite

TI

1891

Collec Adver which unalte thoug printe been Sunda the Co has b howev Annex such, f Sunda first w spond happin therefo script : all res have b was no Collect sours a appear for the form, Mary, the wo change

the rea We are fev Annex and obl variatio Thus, f times: is the For e foot hange. ead of s been

July

ing:st line, ht over nd what

ng and in the in the m. had beseech with a ere not It is of the ed, and as evised, and in point ry were Evening as also the pred before there is om want as being ards the n exact least, to s defects advanished in he book ould like e Prayer

price at

variation

in the Daily Service that we have observed down to the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels excepting in the rubric for the recitation of the Psalms, where are ought to be printed be and at, in, the rubric running thus: '¶ Then shall follow the Psalms in order as they be appointed. And at the end of every psalm throughout the year, and likewise in the end of Benedicite,' &c.

There are also a few unimportant mistakes in the Collects, such as, in the Collect for the First Sunday in Advent, the omission of the article the in the quick and dead. which ought to run as it always had been, and as it stands unaltered in the Black Letter Book, the quick and the dead, though, strange to say, we doubt if there is any Prayer Book printed since the Restoration in which this mistake has not been made. Also, in the repetition of the Collect for Whit Sunday on the Tuesday, the article the was omitted both in the Convocation and the Annexed Books, where the Collect has been written in both books by Sancroft. There are, however, two or three erasures, which seem to prove that the Annexed was not copied directly from the Convocation copy such, for instance, as occurs in the Collect for the Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, where the words eternal happiness were first written, and then altered into heavenly promises, to correspond to the Convocation Book. But the words eternal happiness could not have been invented by a scribe, and therefore must have been transcribed from some other manuscript source; for no printed Prayer Book had anything at all resembling them. Here, then, the Annexed Book may have been corrected by the Convocation Book, but certainly was not copied from it. And the same remark applies to the Collect for Innocents' Day, where the words to be thy confessours and had been written and erased-words which do not appear in any known copy—as also to the heading and Collect for the Annunciation. Here the heading is in the unusual form, The Annunciation of our Lord to the Blessed Virgin Mary, altered into the present form; and the Collect contains the words was made known unto the world, afterwards also changed into the form which we have at present, agreeably to the reading of the Convocation Book.

We now come to the Communion Office, in which there are few variations in our modern Prayer Books from the Annexed Book, yet the whole Office is more full of erasures and obliterations than any other Service. It is only with the variations that we are concerned, which are merely verbal. Thus, for instance, in the second rubric He hath recompensed is printed for *He have recompensed*. In the first rubric after the Nicene Creed it is customary now to omit the words *And the bannes of Matrimony published*.

In the sentence for with such sacrifices God is well pleased the word well, which had been written, has been erased. In the rest of the service there is no other variation that we have noticed excepting, once, the substitution of the word ye in our

Prayer Book for the you of the Annexed.

In respect to variations in the Occasional Offices, we have noticed very few, and those of very slight importance, the word hath having been twice substituted for have in the long rubric of the Service for the Visitation of the Sick being one of the few. There is also the well-known change of the rubric for the Publication of Banns, which has been altered to accommodate churches where there happens to be no Morning Service on certain Sundays. This alteration was made in the year 1752, by a statute of the 26th year of George II.

As regards the Epistles and Gospels, it is well known that they were taken from the Authorized Version of 1611, the text of which was substituted for that of Cranmer's version, which had held its own ground in the Prayer Book up to the last Revision. This part of the book may have been executed more at leisure than the rest, and it does not show signs of haste, there being very few corrections of mistakes either of omission or of redundancy, so that the pages here have a very clean appearance. It may be thought, therefore, that there is no room for criticism here; nevertheless, there are two or three slight variations which may be noted, and as we cannot pretend here to have carefully collated the whole of the text of these Epistles and Gospels with the Annexed Book, it is more than probable that there are some few more which we have not noticed. The frequent changes of ye into you, be into are, and which into who, throughout the book seem to indicate a wish on the part of the Revisers to modernize forms, as they also did the spelling of words, to the standard of their own time. In this attempt they have been far from consistent. Thus it has happened that, for uniformity's sake, modern Prayer Books have in these cases, frequently without authority, recurred to the older form-as, for instance, they have substituted ye for you in the nominative case of a sentence where there are three other instances of ye in the nominative in the Gospel for the Monday before Easter, where the passage in the Annexed Book runs for you have the poor with you always. And the same unauthorized change has been introduced twice in the Gospel for the Wednesday, and once in the in the Gosp Mond and,

1891

the R readi mine of the stitut but in Tueso the cl this I Gosp evide Versi few lin by ou after ' Fathe to the and a ought Gospe lines t evider whilst becau

have a Gospe by the Quino charity originations, and or reading Thurs was a and or printe into a

ıfter

And

ased

the

have

our

have

the

long

one

ubric

ac-

rning

n the

that

the,

rsion,

o the

cuted

ns of

ner of

very

ere is

wo or

annot

e text

k, it is

ch we

you, be

em to

forms,

f their

n con-

sake,

vithout

e, they

a sen-

in the Epistle for the Thursday before Easter, and once again in the Epistle for Tuesday in Easter Week, twice in the Gospel for Whit-Sunday, once in the Epistle for Whitsun-Monday, in the Epistle for the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

and, lastly, in the Gospel for St. Mark's Day.

It was perhaps with a similar idea of modernizing that the Revisers wrote I judge not my own self, where the modern reading is, according to the Authorized Version, I judge not mine own self. On the other hand, in the modern reading of the Collect for Easter Day the form thy has been substituted for thine, which the Annexed Book has in the first but in neither of the two following Collects for Monday and Tuesday. Another form of modernizing has been adopted in the change of which of the Authorized Version into who; but this has been rarely adopted. An instance occurs in the Gospel for Easter Monday where the Annexed Book has, evidently designedly, altered the which of the Authorized Version into who in one case, and has left which unchanged a few lines below, and in both cases has been faithfully followed by our modern Prayer Books; whilst in the Eighth Sunday after Trinity the last words of the Gospel were written My Father who is in heaven, our present books having recurred to the original of the Authorized, My Father which is in heaven; and also in the Epistle for Whitsun-Monday, who believed ought to be printed for which believed; as likewise in the Gospel for the First Sunday after Trinity, in the first few lines the which of the Authorized Version has been altered, evidently on set purpose, into who in the Annexed Book, whilst later down in the same Gospel the word who is used because it is the reading of the English Bible.

Amongst mistakes which we have observed, and which have not been corrected, is the omission of the word is in the Gospel for the Epiphany, in the sentence for thus it is written by the prophet. In the doubtful reading of the Epistle on Quinquagesima Sunday, the Annexed Book has and have no charity, and this must have been designed, for it follows the original reading of the folio of 1611 and of other early editions, the word no having been altered into not very early, and our modern Prayer Books sometimes following the one reading, sometimes the other. Again, in the Gospel for the Thursday before Easter, the reading of the Annexed Book, was cast in prison, is a correct following of the folio of 1611, and ought, therefore, not to be treated as a mistake, as modern printers have almost invariably done by altering the words into was cast into prison. Again, in the Epistle for Easter

nomiere the or with s been d once Eve the Annexed Book, after the words putting away the filth of the flesh, added the word of between away and the, so as to follow the Authorized Version; whereas modern books wrongly omit the word of.

We suppose we must class under the head of mistakes the word *Jesus* for *Jesus* in the second and third Collects of Whitsun-week, as in the Whit-Sunday Collect it is spelt *Jesus*, and these, of course, have been altered in recent editions of

the Prayer Book.

It will have been seen from what we have said that we are advocates for a nearer return to the text of the Annexed Book than at present exists in our Prayer Books. It is true that the variations are few and of slight importance; yet exact accuracy is an important ingredient in such a document. To sum up what we desire, we should say that as regards both stops and initials we see no reason for exact conformity, simply because there is no exact uniformity in the authoritative document itself, inasmuch as when, in the repetition of Psalms, Litany, or Prayers in the different parts of the book, the scribe evidently paid no very close attention to these points. In fact, there is considerable carelessness in the way in which capitals are used for initial letters. Instances are such as the following: 'Pride, vainglory, and Hypocrisy' 'mediator and Advocate'; 'unity, peace, and Concord.' Thus, again, we have 'Confusion of substance' and 'Unity of person,' and many others, from which it is evident that no principle was adopted as regards this point, the most remarkable mere accident in the matter being the continual adoption of the capital (C) without any assignable reason. It is, however, plain that the beauty of the pages of the book depends materially on the absence of capital letters, which are seldom used in the case of nouns, and still more rarely for adjectives —so seldom, indeed, that the epithet holy, even applied to Ghost and Spirit, is uniformly spelt with a small initial. There are, however, certain words in which the capital was designedly used, as, for instance, the Name of God and others where it was with equal design not used, as in the word when it applies to Scripture and not to the Eternal Word. In these respects we think our Prayer Book ought to be made to approach more nearly to the standard, and this would involve, amongst other changes, the dropping of nearly fifty capitals in the Benedicite. With regard to other points, we have already implied that it is desirable that the Annexed Book should be followed implicitly, except in those extremely rare case

bring be, fe and whic lex o Pray be pr they Artic belief it is for the impo be di disap Lectu opinio centu denie Book, with t served an off union been s two ce this ni the co taken recent the Er seems words betwee Greek

relation

We hail the Mission

VOL.

that th

Jerusa

the

the, lern

akes

s of

esus,

s of

t we

true

yet

nent.

ards nity,

oritaon of

oook.

these

way

s are

cord.'

ity of

at no

nark-

ption

how-

pends

eldom

ctives

ed to

nitial.

l was

others

when

these

to ap-

volve, apitals

have

Book

y rare

cases in which it had fallen into a manifest error, whether of the scribe or the supervisor.

And now, in conclusion, we have a very serious charge to bring against those who are responsible, whoever they may be, for printing the Thirty-nine Articles as if they were a part and portion of the English Prayer Book. It is a mistake which is fraught with evil consequences. If it be true that the lex orandi is the lex credendi, the general contents of the Prayer Book certainly give no uncertain sound; but it cannot be pretended by the most ardent admirers of the Articles that they are entirely unambiguous. To say nothing now of the Articles which are directed against some mischievous misbeliefs, and still worse malpractices, of the sixteenth century, it is certain that they were subscribed in a Calvinistic sense for the most part during the first century of their being imposed upon the clergy, and that this sense, which began to be discouraged in the reign of James I., has almost entirely disappeared since the publication of the celebrated Bampton Lectures of the year 1804. Nevertheless, without giving any opinion here as to the animus of those who in the sixteenth century first imposed them upon the clergy, it cannot be denied that, taken by themselves and apart from the Prayer Book, they are susceptible of an interpretation at variance with the Catholic doctrines which have been faithfully preserved in that book; and it is notorious that they constitute an offence and stumbling-block in the way of our complete union with the Churches of the East-that union which has been so often longed for and ardently prayed for for the last two centuries, and of which there are really hopeful signs in this nineteenth century. Let us hope that, if it may be, before the conclusion of its last decade some further steps may be taken for the intercommunion of the Churches. Since the recent action of the Roman Church, intercommunion between the English and the rest of the Western branch of the Church seems more remote and less hopeful than ever. But kindly words and messages have passed, and a better understanding between the authorities of the Church in England and the Greek Patriarchs has sprung up. We greatly fear, however, that the recent renewal of the appointment of a bishop at Jerusalem will do more to frustrate than to promote friendly relations between the Greek and the English Churches. It is

We mean no disrespect to Bishop Blyth when we say that we should hail the day when both he and the proselytizing agents of the Church Missionary Society are removed to other fields of labour. The fact that VOL. XXXII.—No. LXIV.

the apparent isolation from the rest of Christendom that is the main cause of the still continuing dropping off of units at intervals to the Church of Rome. It cannot be denied that a visible union with the Churches of the East would tend indefinitely to strengthen the position of the Church of this country. Surely for a consummation so devoutly to be wished we might gladly submit to some sacrifice. But it is no sacrifice we are pleading for now, when we suggest that the Articles may be removed from a position which seems at least to give them undue prominence, and which there is no ground for

alleging that they are entitled to occupy.

When the practice of printing the Thirty-nine Articles at the end of the Book of Common Prayer commenced we cannot positively say. We have seen a copy of the book with them bearing as early a date as 1697, but it must have been a century later before it became a common practice. Probably they were at first frequently added, together with the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, in the larger editions which were used in churches; but it was long before any printer ventured to add them as an item to the page which contained 'The Contents of this Book,' whereas now they almost as a matter of course appear as part and parcel of the Book of Common Prayer, even in the smallest editions. And thus the great distinction between the two documents is quite lost sight of. The clergy who have signed them in the modified form which was adopted some years ago, and which superseded the older declaration of assent to them, may perhaps be credited with sufficient knowledge of the controversies of the sixteenth century to interpret them aright; but to ordinary laymen not well versed in ecclesiastical history many of their expressions must be extremely perplexing.

We may probably take it for granted that the wide interpretation given of them in the celebrated No. 90 of the *Tracts for the Times*, is that which is mainly adopted by the most influential school of Churchmen amongst us. But it could scarcely be alleged that this mode of interpretation would have met with the approval of those who drew them up. And if this is the case it at least shows that they are of the nature of a temporary expedient to meet an existing difficulty. Indeed this appears on the face of them when they

when English clergymen seek permission to celebrate Holy Communion in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, they are not allowed the use of the altar, speaks volumes as to the light in which we are regarded by the Greek Church. We are surprised that English clergymen expose themselves to such humiliations.

speak sary if by the to sug ever if large: Homi

In

1891

remem two so the en The fin Milma publish 269). with w to go i propose a High school Remem certainl

avoiding one form with the their va Catholic, tions, it of the Chur pating evidence the Anglemunion a Whether

s the

s at

that

tend

this

shed

rifice

ticles

give

d for

les at

annot

them

een a

bably

anons

which

rinter

con-

lmost

Book

d thus

te lost

odified

super-

erhaps

sies of

o ordi-

nany of

e inter-

Tracts

e most

could

would

em up.

of the

g diffi-

en they

mmunion

ise of the

d by the

speak of the Book of Homilies as containing doctrine necessary for these times, and therefore to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly. Now we venture to suggest that probably no one who reads this review has ever heard a homily read in church, whilst probably the large majority of our readers have never read the Book of Homilies at all.

In connexion with this subject it may be worth while to remember that there have been within the last thirty years two suggestions made from two very different quarters for the entire abolition of clerical subscription to the Articles. The first was made by the late Dean of St. Paul's, H. H. Milman. It was addressed to the bishops, and afterwards published in one of the numbers of Fraser's Magazine (lxxi. 269). The principal reason assigned was not, indeed, one with which we should sympathize, nor need we now attempt to go into the subject. It is enough that there was such a proposal coming from one who could scarcely be considered a High Churchman, or indeed a partisan of any particular school of thought. The other was made in the Christian Remembrancer (lvi. 363), a Review which represented what was certainly the most learned section of the clergy.

It would, of course, be quite competent for the Church, which, under pressing necessity of the times, thought good to impose the Thirty-nine Articles, which almost wholly respect the controversies of that day, to withdraw them if occasion should arise. And if they should form a stumbling-block and an obstacle in the way of union with the Churches of the East, it would have to be shown that there was an imperative necessity for their continuance in face of such a desirable

consummation.

And if it be admitted that they have no present effect in avoiding differences of opinion or in uniting the clergy in one form of belief, and that as a matter of fact they co-exist with the presence of three parties, which, without classifying their varieties or subdivisions, we will designate as the Catholic, the anti-sacramental, and the anti-dogmatic sections, it can hardly be alleged that they fulfil any purpose in the Church of England. It is possible we may be anticipating events which are yet in the far distant future; that though friendly communications have been entertained between the Eastern Churches and those in communion with the Anglican Church, any formal proposals for intercommunion are not likely to be made in the present generation Whether this be so or not, the preliminary step of placing the

Articles on their proper footing ought to be taken. They do not belong to the Prayer Book of 1661, and they have no right, therefore, to appear amongst the headings of the contents of the Prayer Book of 1891.

ART. X.—THE GOVERNMENT EDUCATION BILL.

A Bill to make further provision for assisting Education in Public Elementary Schools in England and Wales. (London, 1891.)

WE discussed the question of Free Education in the April number, 1890, of the *Church Quarterly*, and we see no reason to modify or enlarge upon what we then said. But we now stand face to face with the question in its concrete form, as the Government has introduced a Bill into Parliament to carry into effect what Lord Salisbury shadowed forth some years since, and we must expect that either in this session or

next it will become law.

The proposal of the Government is a very simple one: it is to make a grant of 10s. a year to all elementary schools willing to accept it on the condition that where the fee payable on January I last did not exceed that sum, the school shall be made perfectly free from September I next for all children between five and fourteen years of age; and where it did then exceed that amount, the fee shall be reduced to that extent. It further provides that no addition shall be made to the fee charged in any school without the express sanction of the Education Department, and that without such sanction all new schools shall be free. For children under five the school managers may charge a fee not exceeding 2d, a week; and for those over fourteen the limit is placed at 3d. There is no provision for any change in the management of the school, or in the existing arrangements concerning religious instruction. And it is left entirely free to every school to decline the grant, and to remain on the same footing as it The Bill is undoubtedly an honest attempt to carry out Lord Salisbury's promise concerning free or assisted education without inflicting damage on the voluntary schools. The question really is, how far this attempt has been successful.

The more the subject is examined the more beset with difficulties will the subject be found. The North of England

diffi

sche Fair abo

who sma chile chile Lon num sprin occu mora willin and e fellov peop is one with thoug that t feelin

pits a dividi there fees a are hi a high the So one m fees; greate from a recoup

moral

serious found South have be tenance

by red

nev do ve no e con-

July

BILL. tion in Wales.

e April reason we now orm, as nent to h some ssion or

one: it schools fee paye school t for all d where duced to shall be express out such inder five ing 2d. a ed at 3d. rement of religious school to ting as it ttempt to r assisted v schools. been suc-

eset with England differs materially from the South; the rural parts of the country from the urban; educational districts that have school boards from those which have escaped that calamity. Fairly to understand the question we must say a few words

about these differences.

In London and most towns in the South of England there is a large amount of class feeling amongst the people for whose benefit elementary schools are designed. Artisans and small shopkeepers readily pay a higher fee in order that their children may not be educated in the same school with the children of labourers and those of a lower class. There is in London and some other southern towns a considerable number of what are described as 'gutter children,' the offspring of disreputable parents frequently having no regular occupation, who necessarily do much to lower the social and moral tone of any school that they attend. Careful parents willingly make considerable sacrifices to save their children, and especially their daughters, from mixing with such schoolfellows, and in the North, towns and large villages are chiefly peopled by persons engaged in the same occupation. There is one paramount industry on which, or on trades connected with it, the bulk of the population find employment; and though there may be the same diversities of moral character that there are in the South, they do not create the same class feeling that is found there. The steady and unsteady, the moral and the immoral, men work in the same factories and pits and large workshops, and it is impossible to draw a dividing line. The consequence of this is that in the South there is a considerable demand for some schools with higher fees and others with lower; whilst in the North, where wages are high, there is generally one uniform rate of fees, which is a high one, and which is willingly paid. What is needed in the South, therefore, is the union of a number of schools under one management, some quite free, and others charging good fees; whilst in the North free schools must be found to a much greater extent, which there is nothing to hinder all the children from attending, and there is no chance of the managers being recouped for the very serious loss which will fall upon them by reducing their present scale of fees to the Government allowance of 10s. for each child in average attendance. Another serious difference between the North and the South is to be found in the greater sacrifices made by Churchmen in the South for the cause of elementary education. Church schools have been more freely built, and subscriptions for their maintenance more liberally given, in the South, so that the demands

which the changes proposed by the Government would make upon them are not apparently insurmountable. But in the wealthier North, where less has been done in the past, a somewhat unworthy despair appears to have come over many from whom one would have expected a truer and more hopeful view. For, after all, education will not be more costly in the North than it will be in the South, and it will say little for the faith and devotion of northern Churchmen if they show less zeal for training the youthful portion of the community to be good Christians than is evinced elsewhere. Whilst saying this, we would not wish it to be understood that we are unmindful of the heavier burden which the change will

throw upon them.

A comparison between rural and urban schools also shows a great difference. There are few rural schools which charge more than twopence a week: the great majority demand only a penny. All these schools would be benefited by the Government Bill. If it were not that the new code has placed a much heavier burden upon them, it is possible that in some cases the demands upon the subscribers might be lightened. Prebendary Roe, in a paper which he read at the National Society's meeting, stated that he found, after careful investigation, that the sum raised by voluntary subscription for the support of the rural Church schools in Somersetshire amounted to 12s. 11d. for each child in average attendance;1 and there is no reason to suppose that the demand upon the liberality of the supporters of such schools in other counties similarly circumstanced would be less. In urban schools the average fee would be higher, and the number of children in each school greater; therefore the proportionate sum required from voluntary subscriptions would be less; and the substitution of the Government grant for the fees now charged would add to the school finances in comparatively few instances. For it has to be remembered that a payment of 10s. for each child in average attendance is a very different thing from each child attending the school paying a fee of 10s. Taking the country through, one-fifth of the children whose names are on the school registers are always absent; so that the 10s. which would be received if each child paid its own fee shrinks to 8s. under the Government Bill. And as most town schools are open for forty-four or forty-five, and some for forty-seven weeks, in the year, this would reduce the sum received by the managers for each child from 11s., or 11s. 3d., or 11s. 9d., to 8s. when the fee was 3d. a week. But

1 School Guardian, p. 466.

it sh weel ros. situa

1891

tiona boar that woul to ch stron dren schoo rathe for th their fees o schoo these board there the fr schoo Churc becon dimin no sch case v from child yet, a for as pelled their : chiefly occupa high o import their re

The by the and or cation.

make

n the

some-

from

peful

in the

le for

show

unity

Whilst

nat we

ge will

shows

charge

d only

y the

le has

le that

ght be

at the

careful

tion for

setshire

lance;

oon the

ounties

ools the

dren in

equired

ubstitu-

a would

stances.

for each

ng from

Taking

names

that the

own fee

as most

nd some

luce the

IIs., or

ek. But

it should be remembered that any school now charging 3d, a week would be justified in accepting the Government grant of 10s, and charging 1d, a week wherever the exigencies of the situation did not require the school to be free.

A third important difference is to be found between educational districts where there are, and where there are not, school boards. Where such bodies exist it may be taken for granted that they will make their schools free. Members of the board would shrink from facing their constituents if they continued to charge fees in their schools. In districts where there is a strong class feeling amongst the parents who send their children to school this ought to be a help to the voluntary schools, if the managers will boldly charge good fees, or, rather, if they are allowed to do so; and Dr. Rigg, speaking for the Wesleyans, is reported to have said that he believes their schools will profit by the Government Bill, though the fees charged in them are higher than in any other elementary schools. On the other hand, it must be remembered that in these districts the managers are weighted by the heavy school board rates which the people have to pay. In districts where there is no such class feeling, the case will be very much worse; the free board schools will have a tendency to empty voluntary schools that charge fees, so that many, perhaps most, of the Church schools must either accept the Government subsidy and become free, or else expect to find their numbers seriously diminished. In thickly-peopled educational districts which have no school board, such as Birkenhead, Preston, and Stockport, the case will be very different. At present their average fee ranges from 15s. to 17s. To reduce all their fees by 5s. or 7s. for each child would make a tremendous deficit in their accounts, and yet, as they would be bound to provide free school places for as many children as desired them, they would be compelled to do this in many, perhaps in most, or even in all their schools, as the population of Preston and Stockport is chiefly engaged in the same class of manufactures, or in occupations connected with them. It will give the world a high opinion of the religious devotion of the people of these important towns if they rise to the occasion, and maintain their religious independence by voluntarily supplying whatever free education is required.

The difficulties of the position are somewhat heightened by the Government proposal exempting children under five and over fourteen from the benefit of the grant for free education. Last year over 324,000 children under five years of age, or nearly 7 per cent. of those who had their names on the registers of elementary schools, were under five years of age. It is asserted that all school boards will take these children without the payment of fees, and that voluntary schools must do the same, or else they will certainly lose them when they grow older, as they will continue to attend the school to which they are first sent, if the teachers are kind to them. This would make a further inroad on the income of voluntary schools, and would, of course, increase the burden on the ratepayers in districts where there is a school board.

These are the difficulties of the problem: the question is, can there be amendments introduced into the Bill which would enable the Government to fulfil the pledges it has so positively given, not to pass a measure which shall injure the voluntary schools? In answer to this we must say candidly that we think there are some alleviations to which the good people whose difficulties we have been endeavouring to set forth as themselves have described them, have not taken quite sufficiently into account. Whilst saying this, we would distinctly state that we do not doubt the substantial accuracy of all they have advanced. In some schools there is a percentage of fees remitted, or which remain unpaid, and this percentage is said to amount to 10 per cent. on the amount that ought to be paid. This will not be the case under the Government Then, in some districts, it may be possible to have some free places in a school, whilst there are other children from whom a fee may be required; just as now in many country parishes the labourers' children pay a penny a week, whilst the children of the farmers or shopkeepers pay a higher Still, after all has been said, these will be comparatively small alleviations, and to make the Bill answer the promise of its proposers, there must be some more extensive amendments, and it may be well to consider what these should be. For when our enemies tell us that they mean to deprive us of every advantage which the Bill would confer upon us so soon as they have the opportunity, it behoves us to realize that this is our only chance of getting what we require, and unless we speak out now, and press for the amendments which we consider essential, it is certain that we shall never get them.

There are two obvious amendments on which we ought to insist. They would remedy evils of which we have long been complaining, and remove a considerable amount of heart-burning that at present exists. The first is the removal of the 17s. 6d. limit. This is felt as a special grievance.

M su pli

18

tic ins ha is of is thi

an

Ch

the add aut mo oth the ma peo rate is 1 a t a n

por

prii Mic

side core tary Gov sam hav

aver offer paid fee Managers make great exertions, and expend considerable sums to make their schools efficient. They succeed in accomplishing their object. Their school passes a brilliant examination, and is awarded the 'excellent' merit grant by her Majesty's inspector; and then all the pecuniary gain to which they had looked to recoup some of their extraordinary expenditure is mercilessly cut off, and the limit just named deprives them of all the advantage they ought to have gained. The result is most discouraging; the managers are tempted to say, 'If this is the way the Government rewards us for our exertions and success, we will not give them the chance another time;' and so the efficiency of the school is lowered. Last year the Church schools lost more than 20,000% through the operation of this clause.

The other sore evil under which many schools groan is the payment of local rates. The inequality of this burden adds to the sense of its injustice. In some parishes the local authorities are fair and rational, and are content with a moderate amount on which to rate school buildings, whilst in others, prompted by hostility to voluntary schools, they raise the amount to an extent which it is impossible for the managers to pay. Moreover, it is a serious hardship that people who have a definite faith should be compelled to pay rates for the maintenance of schools whose special distinction is that they can teach no definite doctrinal truths. If such a thing as the power of fair judgment could be found, such a mode of taxing denominational schools and their supporters would be felt to be as complete a violation of the principle of religious liberty, as were the persecutions of the Middle Ages which are so fiercely denounced.

The removal of these two grievances would be a considerable help to secure the acquiescence, though not the cordial welcoming, of the Bill by many managers of voluntary schools. The excision of the limits of age for which the Government will pay fees would be a further assistance in the same direction. But for the northern towns, where high fees have been systematically charged, something more is needed,

and what this should be it is not easy to say.

We should be glad if some plan could be devised for raising the Government grant to educational districts where the average fee has been considerably larger than the ten shillings offered by the Bill—for example, if twelve shillings could be paid to the schools in educational districts where the average fee now exceeds that sum. At first sight this might not seem equitable, as it would have the appearance of giving most to

on is, would tively ntary at we beople rth as suffi-

inctly

of all

July

ars of

these

ntary

lose

ttend

s are

1 the

crease

is a

entage entage ought nment have ildren many week, higher atively

nise of menduld be. rive us us so realize re, and

lments

never

e ought ve long unt of emoval evance.

189

bee

suc

hav

tas

sho

chi

do

we

SO

dor

ma

the

mo

affo

is t

sib

dis

SYS

nat

est

reli

peo

sch

hea

pro

oui

wit

wh

if t

tion

wil

tha

be

the wealthier districts, and it would certainly be doing most for those who had done the least for themselves. But there is another point of view from which the subject may be regarded. The purchase by the Government of the school fees of the locality may be looked upon as a commercial transaction. These fees have been collected with the full sanction of the Government. Nay, in many places her Majesty's inspectors have encouraged the managers of schools to raise their fees. They have therefore acquired the right to levy them; and if Parliament sees fit to deprive them of this right, a claim certainly exists that they should be equitably compensated. We fear that if the Bill is not to produce a large amount of dissatisfaction and irritation, some method must be devised for meeting the outcry which will be raised in the influential northern towns.

Another important change in the Bill that ought to be insisted upon is the time at which it should begin to take The Education Department closes its year on August 31; it is therefore proposed that the system of free schools should commence on September 1. This would give no time for making preparation, no time for adjusting the school to a new system. The Bill cannot be expected to become law before the middle of August, or even later; and until it has passed through all its more important stages, it must be a matter of doubt whether it will not be postponed. Then August and September are months when all people who can afford to take a holiday—amongst whom we must include many school managers—are from home, and when it would be impossible to determine what schools in a town should be made free, and what schools should continue to charge fees. For such arrangements require a nice adjustment of pecuniary responsibilities, and the acceptance of principles and modes of action with respect to the management of schools which necessarily demand a large amount of consideration and discussion.

There are other amendments of a minor character needed in the Bill which it is unnecessary to discuss here, and it is a happiness to know that our friends are on the alert and are taking counsel amongst themselves; and we trust that they will not only propose but insist to the utmost of their power on such alterations in the Bill as will give it a fair chance of answering the promises made concerning it by different members of the Government who have given pledges concerning it to the country.

As we have said before, we regret that free education has

giv Ch Th in tha wh

we

sho

the

XUM

July

ost

e is

led.

the

on.

the

ors

ees.

d if

aim

ted.

t of

sed

tial

be

ake

on

free

ould

the

l to

and

s, it

ned.

ople

nust

n it

own

e to

ust-

e of

age-

t of

ded

is a

are

hey

wer

e of

em-

ning

has

been introduced; but if it is inevitable that we must have such a measure, there are no politicians in whom we should have greater confidence than those who have undertaken the task. On every account we think it was better that parents should bear some portion of the cost of the education of their children, and we still hope that very many will continue to do so, if this Bill should become law. Whilst saying this we must add that we trust none of our friends will be so ignoble as to express their dislike for what has been done by abandoning their schools, and so let their irritation master their religious principle. They must remember that the children of to-day will be the men and women of tomorrow, and that we are responsible for doing what we can to educate them aright. If they neglect the opportunities afforded them of receiving really Christian training, the fault is theirs, and, deeply as we should grieve over it, the responsibility would not rest with us; if we throw up our schools in disgust, and leave them only an unsectarian or non-religious system of education, we must bear the blame for ever if the natural consequence follows, and our people become more estranged from the Church and from all real belief in revealed religion. When the Education Act of 1870 was passed, timid people asserted that it was all over with our denominational schools; but there were amongst us those who had stouter hearts and a more real faith, and our Church schools now provide double the accommodation which they did then. our poor country schools have been nobly maintained, notwithstanding the heavy burdens placed upon their supporters, what shall be thought of the wealthier Church people in towns if they close or surrender their schools so soon as an additional burden is thrown upon them? The Roman Catholics will not abandon their schools: is our religion less dear to us than theirs is to them? And this is the conclusion which will be drawn by the world at large if in faint-hearted despair we give up the solemn duty which the Supreme Head of the Church has placed upon us, of 'feeding His lambs.'

There is one word more which it may be well to add. There are Church schools in which the management is vested in the clergyman alone, or in him and a co-opted body, so that the subscribers have no voice in controlling schools for which they are expected to furnish the funds needed for their maintenance. Such a system is bad in itself, and seriously weakens the Church's power of defending her schools; we should be thankful if those responsible for such schools seized the present opportunity for extending to persons elected by

the subscribers a share in the management, and we think they would make their work still more complete if they permitted the parents of the children in the schools to add one or two of their number to the committee in whose hands the care of the school was placed.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Teaching of Christ: its Conditions, Secret, and Results, By the Right Rev. J. Moorhouse, Bishop of Manchester. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

THE first of these sermons is on 'The Nature and Limits of Inspiration.' It is an attempt to show that the surrender of much which is ordinarily associated with the idea of Inspiration does not necessarily imply the abandonment of the doctrine itself. The Bishop of Manchester explains the existence of the earliest Scriptural records in this way. By a comparison of the Biblical and Babylonian accounts of the Deluge, he points out that the distinctive feature in which they differ is that the Babylonian account contains 'a polytheistic conception of the Divine Power' (p. 6), while the Biblical account proclaims that there is only one God. Regarding Abraham as 'the first monotheist of whom history speaks' (p. 6), he assumes that he received from tradition the polytheistic account of the Deluge, and modified it so as to correspond with what he himself believed about God. Thus, he made the story speak of one God to the exclusion of every other, and represented the Flood as a judgment upon wickedness, instead of being, as in the Babylonian account, a slaughter of the innocent with the guilty. Similarly Bishop Moorhouse represents the 'institution of sacrifice' as 'inherited by the Hebrews from their heathen Semitic forefathers' (p. 16), and as being gradually systematized and purified in the times of Samuel, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. In like manner he asserts that 'the gradual formation of the historical literature of the Israelites' (p. 19) should make us expect that 'an historian like the author of the Books of the Chronicles' should suppose 'that the completed law was known to the earlier kings,' just as St. Jude, 'who lived in an age of some literary culture, quotes as the prediction of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, words which we know to belong to an apocryphal work written in the second century before Christ' (p. 20). Thus, the 'accuracy' of the record is of no importance; the Inspiration lies in the historian's 'interpretation of the religious meaning and tendency of the acts and incidents which he narrates' (pp. 20, 21).

We feel that the position of this sermon is open to very grave objections. Critically it is full of assumptions. It is at least as likely, in the abstract, that a true account of the Flood and other matters was inherited by Abraham and incorporated into the Book of Genesis, and that other accounts existed elsewhere in a corrupted

KUM

for the on recad

18

the that wi The like see

we co un qu wr If pri ear

diff Ch rel log Mi tio

In

po

Hair the low

for sio ins

wit

Ti

hey

ted

two

e of

ults.

ster.

s of

nuch

not

shop

ords

unts

they

cep-

aims

ono-

eived

ified

God.

every

ness,

f the

sents

from

ually aiah,

'the

. 19) looks

nown

some

from

ritten

racy' e his-

f the

grave

st as other

Book

upted

form, as that Abraham altered the tradition which he received. The theory of the development of sacrifice, and of the dates of the law, is one for which, in anything like the form the Bishop's argument requires, we cannot think there is sufficient evidence. There is no adequate critical reason for regarding Abraham as 'the first monotheist.' The words, 'they served other gods,' 1 while they assert that some before Abraham were idolaters, are in no way inconsistent with such idolatry being a corruption from truth previously known. The words ascribed to Enoch in the Epistle of St. Jude 2 may very likely, speaking merely critically, have been spoken by him and preserved by a true tradition, although not within the Old Testament We see theological objections to the theory which critically we regard as resting on assumptions. If the first part of Genesis had consisted of early myths, revised by Abraham so as to be theologically unobjectionable, but without any special Divine guidance as to any question of fact, we do not think our Lord and the New Testament writers could have used the events recorded as if historically true.3 If the first chapters are not such myths, but are true accounts, the primitive religion was monotheism,4 and there was sacrifice from very early times in the worship of the one true God.5 And it would be difficult to reconcile the use by the writer of the Books of the Chronicles of events which did not happen as the substratum of religious truth with the inspiration by the all-holy God of the theology thus taught. A position like that defended by the Bishop of Manchester appears to us to be wholly different from a full recognition of a real human element in the inspired books.

One point we have already raised leads us naturally to the subject of the second Sermon—'Limitations of our Lord's Knowledge.' In it the Bishop's high intellectual gifts are put out with great power and effect. Gradually reducing the origin of all sensation to will, he contemplates briefly the theory of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann that

'the will which is in existence is the will to live, the blind, unscrupulous will, taking counsel neither of wisdom nor of pity, deterred neither by misery nor ruin to pass into richer life;'

and noticing

'how difficult it is sometimes to resist the conclusion which seems to be forced upon us, that all the brighter aspects of life are simply an illusion, set up by the will to live, in order to make all creatures its blind instruments' (p. 28),

he points out 'one definite ground' on which issue can be joined with 'the conclusion of the pessimists':—

'The human will, at any rate, is not simply a blind will to live. It is a will, as we know, instructed by the understanding and inspired by

¹ Josh. xxiv. 2. ³ St. Jude, 14, 15.

³ St. Matt. xxiv. 37-39; St. Luke, xvii. 26, 27; Rom. v. 12; 1 Ep. to Tim. ii. 13, 14; Heb. xi. 4-7; 1 St. Pet. iii. 19, 20.

⁴ Gen. i.-iv. ⁵ Gen. iv. 3-5, viii. 20.

the conscience. How, then, can we believe that the will which evolved or created man is so far inferior to that which it created? Surely there cannot be more in the effect than there was, at least implicitly, in the cause (pp. 28, 29);

but passes on to acknowledge that such an argument still leaves much undetermined:—

'Say, however, what we will in answer to the contention of the pessimist, it must be acknowledged that the problem of being will ever present difficulties, not only to man, but to every creature in God's intelligent universe, who knows only as man knows, by means of limitation. To all, then, the question must be of profoundest interest—to angels as well as to men—what is the *nature* of God's will. Is it a will to live or a will to love?' (p. 29).

We doubt whether what is said about the angels is rightly expressed; but, with this exception, the statement is valuable. Bishop Moorhouse goes on to show how in the Incarnation of Him Who is the true and eternal God the problem is solved by the manifestation that 'the will, which is God, is a will to love' (p. 30). A good deal follows which we cannot accept. The reality of our Lord's human nature is regarded as necessitating its being subject to limitations. These limitations are asserted to exist in His knowledge as Man. His ignorance is taken to imply fallibility. If it is asked, 'How can the fallible dwell with the infallible, ignorance with omniscience, in the same personality?' (p. 32), it is answered that it is a mystery, but a mystery which may rightly be compared with the truth that as regards man,—

'while holding fast the immanency of the Divine will, we must recognise that this will has subjected itself in the personal life of man to such limitations, that we can freely direct the portion of Divine volition lent to us, either to the service of the selfish will to live or of the Divine will to love '(p. 34).

It is true that 'it is of the essence of our human nature to be limited in faculty' (p. 31). But as regards knowledge, it is at least a tenable opinion that the limitation in our Lord's Humanity was only of such a kind as to withhold from it knowledge which it is impossible for the human mind to grasp.¹ Consequently, it may be held that there was in Him as Man no ignorance of anything which the finite mind of man is capable of knowing. And even if this opinion is wrong, and if there was in our Lord's human nature ignorance of some matters within the range of the powers of human minds, such a conclusion would afford no ground for a further statement that as Man He was in any respect fallible. We can no more think that He Who never ceased to be God, and whose Manhood was indissolubly united with His Deity in one Divine Person, could be mistaken and a teacher of error, than we can suppose that He could have sinned. Bishop Moorhouse seems to

of galre

to i

189

liev imp ing as r (p. grou here exce men and

trast

bein to d the t love we a teach the s know the capa self.

No s shall recog Depralmos apost nothin God's or the with t

dom with

¹ This opinion is explained in, e.g., St. Thom. Aq., Summa Theologica, 111. x. 1-3.

ıly

ed

ere

he

res

the

ver lli-

To

25

or

ex-

ble.

of

the

30).

our

ject

ow-

t is

vith

that

vith

cog-

n to

tion

the

be

s at

nity

nich

y, it

any-

And

man rs of

or a

We

hose

vine

can

s to

heo-

self.

us to fail to have a real grasp on the truth of the single Personality of our Lord, not only because of the passages to which we have already referred, but also because when he is speaking of His 'infallible intuition of spiritual truth' (p. 39, cf. p. 38), he bases that 'intuition' not on the personal union of the human nature with the Divine nature, but on 'the supernatural aid of the Spirit' (p. 37), parallel to, though more complete than, that given to the inspired writers of the Bible. Surely such a mode of treating the question is to ignore the most important factor in the case.

It is fair to notice that Bishop Moorhouse adds: 'Had He pronounced His decision' (i.e. on critical questions) 'I would have believed Him' (p. 41), and argues that no ascription of authorship is implied in any reference of our Lord to passages of Scripture, including the 110th Psalm. Yet if our Lord in His Humanity was fallible as regards everything but directly spiritual truth, as is in one place (p. 32) asserted and in other places implied, it is difficult to see what ground there is for this confidence in His judgment. We may not here discuss the bearing of our Lord's references to particular writers except to say that we cannot doubt that our Lord frames an argu-

ment and bases his claim on the Davidic authorship of Psalm cx.,1

and therefore makes it certain that that Psalm is by David.

The third sermon opens with a very able comparison and contrast of Buddhism and Christianity, an essential point of difference being noticed in the 'central purpose' of 'the Buddha' being 'simply to deliver men from suffering' (p. 51), while the master-thought of the teaching of Christ was to show man his true relation to the God of love. In this master-thought of the Fatherhood of God is to be found, we are told, the 'measure and explanation' (p. 57) of all Christian teaching and the 'nature and extent' (p. 60) of all Christian duty. And the strength for the fulfilment of the obligations which will thus become known may be received through the knowledge of and union with the 'one person' in whom 'human nature . . . has proved itself capable of the patient purity which is needed' (p. 61), our Lord Him-

'Then to us, too, labour shall become a necessity and sacrifice a joy. No squalor of the slums and no horror of the crime that haunts them shall repel us; for under the foul forms of the very vilest life we shall recognize the infinite value and eternal destiny of our Father's children. Depraved they may be, and sunken they may be into the depths of an almost bestial vice, but with His spirit glowing within us who found apostles among publicans and disciples among abandoned women, nothing will daunt our courage or quell our confidence. The heart of God's child, we shall tell ourselves, beats beneath the coarsest brutality or the foulest rags, and it is for us to speak to it, to wake it up, to thrill it with the electric touch of our own Christ-quickened souls, and to bring it home again to the Father's bosom' (pp. 61, 62).

Thus, the Bishop passes to some very noble words :-

In the discourses which follow on 'The Law' and 'The Kingdom' the independence of our Lord of His surroundings is shown with a good deal of detail, and the conclusion drawn that His' will

¹ St. Matt. xxii. 41, 45; St. Mark, xii. 35-7; St. Luke, xx. 41-4.

to love' shows He has His 'wisdom,' His 'power,' His 'superabounding life,' 'from those infinite depths of the Deity in which He dwells, in the communion of the Father' (p. 113). We have noticed a striking passage on the Agony in the Garden. We do not think the Bishop is right in putting aside the interpretations of this, according to which our Lord shrank from 'the tortures of His approaching death,' and was bearing 'the burden of the universal guilt' (p. 110). The Gospels seem to represent Him as feeling by anticipation in that most terrible struggle all the agonies of His Passion. But into the complex whole there may well have entered also the strain of conflicting desires that were possible to His Humanity, as in the wilderness the human desire for food would rise up in opposition to the determination to do the will of God; ' and, if so, there may be much truth in the description ' which culminates in the words:—

'It was a conflict of love against love—of that vaster love, which is Divine, against the human love, which is intense in proportion to the nearness of its object. . . . Could the mother love the whole human family more dearly than her own child? Could the patriot love the whole world so well as to provoke the enmity of his fatherland? And can Christ love so well the image of His Father in the universal human heart as to brave the hatred, the scorn, the murderous frenzy of His own Israel?' (p. 111).

We do not like some passages ³ in 'The Unseen World,' but it is satisfactory to find the Bishop teaching on the subject of demoniacal possession that a belief in the truthfulness of our Lord compels us to think that 'He believed in the existence of a kingdom of darkness' (p. 128), while the confident assertion of some that all men must eventually be saved is set aside by the consideration:—

'If all men are to be saved at the last, this, at least, is certain—that they cannot be saved by that method of force which, robbing them of

1 'Jesus could feel no inward inclinableness to any act which was not in itself good, pure, and honest, but He could feel an inward desire for food, and yet that desire be in opposition to the demands of the Divine Will. In the Agony there is the same sort of struggle, the craving of the will of sense to be delivered from the awful sufferings of the Passion; the collision between the pure instincts of a nature which shrank from pain and death, and "the commandment" which He had "received of the Father." On the one side there is a struggle which Christ could not know because of His sinlessness, the struggle of an evil nature with the temptations which are homogeneous with it; on the other, there is a struggle which was possible to him, and which we cannot fully know, which arose from His perfect knowledge and acceptance of all that His Mission involved according to the Divine Appointment. . . The Human Will of Jesus braved the storm of Temptation, and, though unable to be overwhelmed, yet suffered the tension, the toil, and the weariness of the conflict to bring us relief.' (Hutchings, The Mystery of the Temptation, pp. 126, 127, 135.)

² There are one or two phrases we would gladly see slightly altered.

³ E.g. the ignoring on p. 121 of the bearing of such passages as I Sam. xvi. 14 on the Old Testament beliefs about evil spirits, the comments on Dr. Martensen's theory about Satan on pp. 128-130, and the discussion of the meaning of the word always on pp. 139-143.

ning
of t
estir

word

this !

6]

18

free

not

will

sider, detern the pl been that condo cern coorder worder worder us, thr partly binatic charace purity tions o

Bu lence, social s alone . efforts a the 'Fa munion noble, I goodne sufferer, birth-th ness of labourer mutual a

It is Christ a

in Church VOL. uly

er-

He

ced

ac-

ach-

(p.

tion

But

rain

the

n to

y be

ch is

o the

world

t love

brave

111).

t it is

niacal

us to

ness'

must

-that

nem of

was not sire for

Divine

ving of

assion;

ak from

eived of

ould not

with the

v know,

hat His

Human

ole to be

ss of the

uptation,

altered. as 1 Sam.

ments on iscussion

freedom, would leave them incapable of virtue and goodness. And if not by force, then it must be as possible always, as it is now, for the finite will to resist the Infinite' (p. 143);

and it is said that the existence of unending punishment is therefore consistent with 'the will to love' of the 'Almighty Father,' who 'willeth all men to be saved' (p. 143).

The last sermon, on 'Christ and the Social Revolution,' beginning with an historical sketch of the development of the realization of the meaning of Christ's teaching, which perhaps somewhat overestimates the ignorance of some dark times, grounds great hopes on the increased interest in 'the personal teaching and example' (p. 155) of Christ,' and the 'better understanding of the meaning of Christ's words' which 'the social movements of our own time—themselves largely due to the Gospel—are enabling us to gain' (p. 156). On this last point the Bishop says:—

'I can remember the time when to have required employers to consider, in fixing wages, in arranging workshops, in building cottages, in determining the hours of labour, not only profits, but also and more, the physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of working-men, would have been looked upon as a kind of lunacy. Christ might indeed have said that one human soul was of more value than the whole world, but that, no doubt, was a kind of Oriental figure, and at any rate it was no concern of those who took the trouble of prosecuting worldly labours in order to make money. No change whatever has been made in the words of Christ, but how much more those words have come to mean to us, through the reluctant recognition which has been forced upon all, partly by the teaching of great humanitarians, and partly by the combination of labourers, that, after all, man is more than money, that character is greater than possessions, that human truth and honour, purity and love, are more than all the victories of war, or the accumulations of peace' (p. 158).

But these hopes are sometimes dimmed by selfishness and violence, and we are reminded that self-sacrifice alone will make any social schemes successful, and therefore 'Christianity, and Christianity alone . . . can at once justify, elevate, and direct the industrial efforts and aspirations of our time' (pp. 161, 162), while to believe in the 'Fatherly love' of God and our restoration to 'the broken communion with that love' by the life and death of Christ, is to live the noble, happy lives of obedience to God which recognize the Divine goodness in 'the innocence of the child, and the patient faith of the sufferer,' 'the pain of remorse, the stirrings of compunction,' the birth-throes of better resolve,' and in which may be won back 'clearness of vision and readiness for self-sacrifice,' so that capitalists and labourers alike will aim at a common good and 'the progress of mutual confidence and love' (pp. 162, 163).

It is the one ground of hope. The revelation and the life of Christ are the key to the enigmas of the world, and supply the

¹ It is interesting to compare a paragraph on p. 155 with a passage in Church, *The Oxford Movement*, pp. 167, 168.

VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

L L

possibility of redressing all human wrongs. And our conviction is that this supreme position of Christ, which we do not doubt is as dear to the Bishop of Manchester as to ourselves, depends on the belief in His entire infallibility, which in the second of these sermons is set aside.

The Oracles of God. Nine Lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration, and on the Special Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the Present Time. With two Appendices. By W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford Preacher at Whitehall. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

THE object of Dr. Sanday's book is stated in the opening words of the Preface.

'The duty of the theological professor appears to be twofold: on the one hand to advance by all the means in his power the detailed study of the subject committed to him, and on the other to do what he can to help the public mind to clear itself in times of difficulty and perplexity. It is with some reluctance and self-distrust that the writer of these pages has turned away for the moment from the first of these functions to take up the second. . . . Still, the call has seemed to come to him, and he has obeyed it to the best of his ability' (p. vii).

The book thus written necessarily claims attention. Dr. Sanday's position and attainments, the great services he has rendered to Christian truth in his earlier works on *The Fourth Gospel* and *The Gospels in the Second Century*, make it impossible to pass by anything he writes without a good deal of thought. And the calm, gentle tone of his recent book, touching as it does a controversy which has been the cause of grave trouble and anxiety, calls for a respectful listening to his words. If his own statement is true, that 'never, as it seems to me, has a great and really momentous question been approached from all sides in so excellent a temper' (pp. 103, 104), he has himself striven to maintain such a state of things as he describes.

The Lectures, as the Preface indicates, have in view the disquietude of some Christian people at the change in the way in which the Bible is being regarded. Dr. Sanday thinks such a change to be necessary. The comparison of the Old Testament dates with the Assyrian and Babylonian chronology, of the 'Biblical stories' (p. 10) about the Creation and the Flood with the corresponding Babylonian versions, joined with the 'critical investigation of the Bible itself' (p. 11), make it impossible, in his judgment, to retain customary opinions about the Holy Scriptures. The human element in the Bible, recognized to a certain extent for a long time past, is thus shown to be larger than had been supposed. Behind it is the Divine element, and between them the 'organic union' (p. 16), which makes it impossible for us to draw a hard and fast line between the two. The uncertainty as to the original text of parts of the Old and New Testament, the ungrammatical character of the language employed

by t adn ori of c acqu matt time laws due i elem heart most Mose and I contin tion degre amoun culty i is gain for pre 'which of ger We ga criticis have a and in between a very tion car stateme (pp. 95 teaching is a clea as based ratified

189

'If it Moses, o case shou question planation only God to the Hutell us that they are of thing which they argue one thing, supposition as Ho.

besides i

ent of e Old ppenland's Oxford

July

on is

is as

n the

mans,

ld: on letailed that he nd pervriter of of these to come

anday's ered to be! and pass by he calm, troversy lls for a rue, that question pp. 103, ags as he

the disin which age to be with the s'(p. 10) abylonian ale itself' ustomary at in the st, is thus he Divine ch makes an the two. and New employed

by the New Testament writers, the ignorance of science now generally admitted, point to a likelihood that 'the circumstances' of the 'origin' (p. 26) of the Scriptures were not very different from those of other books. May we not, therefore, expect to find an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of history, the incorporation of old matter by a new writer, the reference of institutions existing at the time of writing to a date when they did not exist, the ascription of laws and customs to one great teacher, to whom the germ of them is due? All this, Dr. Sanday thinks, leaves untouched the Divine element, which is shown in the way in which the Bible appeals to the hearts and helps the lives of 'plain men and women' (p. 42), and most distinctly claimed in the accounts of the call and ministry of Moses and the Prophets and St. Paul. How gradually the human and Divine elements shade off into one another is shown by the uncontinuous character of the Inspiration of the Prophets, the evolution of morals, the use of documents, the distinction between degrees of authority by St. Paul. In all this there is a certain amount of loss. There is less clearness, less certainty, greater difficulty in applying Scripture to practical life. But, we are told, there is gain as well. Our Lord did not hesitate to substitute 'principles for precepts' (p. 45). We gain in truth, since those propositions 'which are ultimately established-those which obtain a large amount of general acceptance—will do so because they are true' (p. 79). We gain in security, because 'belief which has been itself tested by criticism-which comes out as the result of a critical process-cannot have any further solvent applied to it' (p. 81). We gain in reality and in the emphasis of great ideas as moving forces. The line between true and false inspiration is not regarded by Dr. Sanday as a very easy one to draw, and though he says that no false inspiration can be within the Canon of Holy Scripture, he startles us by the statement that the Canon may in the future have to be revised (pp. 95, 96). The eighth Lecture deals with the relation of the teaching of our Lord to the criticism of the Old Testament. There is a clear and strong assertion of the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, as based on His own words, as unquestioned by the Apostles, as ratified by the Church. A passage follows which we think others besides ourselves will read with very great pain :-

'If it should be proved that the law, as we have it, was not written by Moses, or that the 110th Psalm was not written by David, what in that case should we say to the affirmations of the Athanasian Creed? The question... is premature; but if we are forced to answer it... the explanation must lie in the fact that He of whom we are speaking is not only God but Man. The error of statement would belong in some way to the Humanity and not to the Divinity. But here some theologians tell us that no such mistake is possible, even to the Humanity. When they are confronted with our Lord's own assertion that there was one thing which He did not know—the hour of His own Second Coming—they argue that the two things are different, that imperfect knowledge is one thing, erroneous teaching (though it is hardly teaching, only a presupposition in what is taught) is another. Again, when such an expression as He maketh His sun to rise is referred in like manner to imperfect

science, that they admit, but maintain that questions relating to the authorship of the Old Testament touch more nearly the subject-matter of Revelation. Are these distinctions valid? Are they valid enough to be insisted on so strongly as they must be if the arguments based upon them are to hold good? I greatly doubt it. . . . One hypothesis, however, I think we may reject beforehand. I should be loth to believe that our Lord accommodated His language to current notions, knowing them to be false. I prefer to think, as it has been happily worded, that "He condescended not to know" (pp. 109-111).

The last lecture, on 'The Special Value of the Old Testament at the Present Time,' uses certain speculations as to the influence of Greek thought on the Christian religion as an occasion for empha sizing that it is a needed work 'to go back to the old Hebraic foundations of our religion, and lay them again more deeply and more firmly, or rather see how they have been laid by an Architect wiser

and mightier than we' (p. 125).

It is, as we have said, with great pain that we have read the statement that our Lord in His Humanity might be mistaken. opinion cuts at the root both of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation and of the practical value of the teaching of our Lord. truth of the single Personality of the Incarnate Word, which is implied in Holy Scripture,1 and has been affirmed as a necessary part of the Faith by the Universal Church, 2 is incompatible with any other belief than that the thoughts of Him who is personally God are unerring. And if He took human nature in such a way as to be susceptible of error, what ground have we for continuing to assert that He was incapable of sin, or that His words are an infallible guide to holiness of life? We do not ourselves think that our Lord in His Humanity was ignorant of any matters within the power of human thought.3 We think it most agreeable to the doctrine of the Incarnation to explain the growth of our Lord's human nature in wisdom as a growth in the experiential knowledge of what from the first was theoretically known,4 and as a part of the acquiring of sympathy by the facts of the Incarnate life. We are disposed to regard the passage in St. Mark xiii. 32 as teaching that our Lord possesses His knowledge of the day of His second coming, as He possesses His Divine Being Itself, as a gift from the Father, and that the Father alone, as an ultimate source, has the knowledge referred to.5 But

1 See a most useful table in Bright, Sermons of St. Leo the Great on the Incarnation, p. 85 in edition of 1862, p. 130 in edition of 1886.

In the general acceptance of the proceedings of the Council of

Ephesus of 431 A.D. about the Incarnation.

³ See St. Thom. Aq. Summa Theologica, III. x. I-3.

⁴ See St. Thom. Aq. Summa Theologica, III. xii. 2, xv. 3; Wilberforce, Doctrine of the Incarnation, p. 85 in edition of 1852, pp. 71, 72 in edition of 1885; Liddon, Bampton Lectures, pp. 456-458 in edition of 1878, pp.

464-466 in edition of 1890.

See St. Basil, Ep. 236 (al. 391). Those orthodox writers who have not accepted this view, have either regarded our Lord as speaking of a real ignorance as Man, or interpreted the statement as asserting merely that for the purposes of teaching He does not know. Both these explanations appear to be less satisfactory than that given above.

1891 whet Divi

holdi in sp be ur confi langu if our of a]

W

recog ance us ab suffici in Ins tant d the Se or the editor existe But it Churc teachi as to these : of the His A whatev rences

regard Church for the ments : meanin is invol the aut Bible, a phecy, have be have be recogni say the attitude eager pr

we cann

On

works

have p

July

the

h to

upon

ever,

t our

m to

"He

nt at

ce of

pha

foun-

more

wiser

state-

This

ncar-

is im-

y part

re un-

e sus-

rt that

iide to

in His

numan

Incar-

risdom

rst was

thy by

rd the

ses His

ses His

Father

5 But

reat on

uncil of

erforce,

edition 878, pp.

ho have

king of a

g merely

se expla-

whether ignorant or not of some matters, since He is personally Divine, where He asserts or implies He asserts or implies unerringly.

Nor can we agree with Dr. Sanday that there is any difficulty in holding the belief which he emphatically sets aside, that our Lord, in speaking of the sun rising, accommodated His language so as to be understood by His hearers, since at the present day, without any confusion of mind or sacrifice of truth, men of exact thought and language use the same phraseology. It would be altogether different if our Lord had used as a basis of teaching the Davidic authorship of a Psalm which David did not write.

We are not among those, if there are any, who regret the clearer recognition of the human element in Holy Scripture. It is in accordance with the general workings of God, and with what the Bible tells us about itself, that natural knowledge should be used where it is sufficient. There would not be a good reason for ceasing to believe in Inspiration if it should at any time become clear that an unimportant date or name was wrongly given in the original text of one of the Scriptural books. The use of documents by an inspired writer, or the codifying of some part of the record and law by an inspired editor, would only be a sign of the supernatural powers utilising what existed in the natural course of events by the Providence of God.1 But it is a serious question how far the Bible could be the guide the Church has regarded it as being, if its doctrines are built upon or its teaching enforced by histories which are not true. An Inspiration as to faith and morals implies an Inspiration as to facts on which these are based. And it appears to us to be a necessary consequence of the use made of parts of the Old Testament by our Lord and His Apostles, that such histories as those of the Fall and the Flood, whatever the right interpretation of particular details, describe occur-

rences which actually happened. One of the reasons why we regret the publication of some recent works dealing with the subject of Inspiration, is the difficulty they have put in the way of that balanced teaching which we ourselves regard as the truth. There are probably a good many English Churchmen who two years ago were thinking that the time was coming for the publication of some work which would supply clear statements about the human side of Holy Scripture, would recall the real meaning of parts of the Old Testament, would distinctly show what is involved in some questions of authorship, and, while maintaining the authority of the New Testament teaching about the rest of the Bible, alike in its testimony to facts and its interpretation of prophecy, would remove certain misconceptions which not infrequently have been a source of doubt. Under no circumstances would it have been an easy task, but the hopes which some had of a wider recognition of a clearer conception of the revelation of truth have, to say the least, been greatly darkened by the confusion and wrong attitude of mind which have not unnaturally been produced by the eager pressing of views of Inspiration and our Lord's authority, which we cannot but regard as untenable. That confusion Dr. Sanday has

¹ See Liddon, The Inspiration of Selection, pp. 12-14.

attempted to lessen with the serious purpose characteristic of an earnest Christianity, but, with all respect for the excellence of his motives and the temperate spirit with which his work has been done, we can only regard some crucial opinions in *The Oracles of God* as

destructive of truths it is essential to maintain.

There are two details we wish to notice. The statements on pages 84, 95, 96, 123, 124 do not appear to us to attach sufficient value to the settled judgments of the whole Church; and secondly, the use (p. 71) made of a passage in St. Paul's writings seems to be founded on a false interpretation. When St. Paul' distinguishes between what is commanded by the Lord and what he himself commands, the distinction, in our opinion, is not between differing degrees of the Inspiration granted to the Apostle, but between the expressed commands of Christ in His ministry on earth and the ordinary use of the apostolic authority by St. Paul. We think a different way of regarding these two matters might lead some to very different conclusions than those of parts of Dr. Sanday's work.

Fidelity and Sympathy united in True Teachers. A Sermon preached at the Cuddesdon College Festival, Tuesday, May 26, 1891. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. Published by request. (Oxford and London: Parker and Co., 1891.)

ONE of the more serious signs in the religious thought of our own day is a tendency to regard theological beliefs as matters of opinion. Even among those who are accepting to a very great extent the Faith of the Catholic Church there is too often wanting a due sense of the sacredness of revealed truth, and of the claim which it makes on the mind and conscience of man. For whatever reason, we seem to be in no small danger of losing that strong appreciation of the duty of Christians to be witnesses to the teaching of God, which was so marked a feature in the great English Churchmen we know as the 'Tractarians.' Together with too much speculation, and too great restlessness, there have come among us an unwillingness to be simply faithful to the trust committed to our charge, and a want of realization that the acceptance of religious beliefs is a matter of tremendous responsibility demanding the most careful consideration and involving the most vital interests. It is painful sometimes to observe the lightheartedness with which the most solemn truths are in some cases accepted and in other cases ignored, or to notice the excessive influence of individual teachers as compared with the regard paid to the verities of the Faith.

This lightheartedness about belief, if it is allowed to continue and increase, will do its ruinous work in practical life. Closely connected with it is the loss, from time to time to be observed, of the awe for the presence and working of God which marked the 'Tractarian' attitude towards worship and the Sacraments. We do not think we imagine that the care taken to preserve the thoughtful use of the services of the Church, and a fully prepared and devotional approach

to that por Good be trut live:

189

fear been tive prea year time sym

difficunch "in varied argument can conference of H the in that

but 1

6 not a fying is an of fid pathi mast and g to the away " Tin Paul' quest doctr decid sidera or sta if it is

of illudered

¹ I Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25.

to the Sacraments, is not infrequently becoming less, we will not say than might be desired, but than ought to be secured. And in proportion as we cease to maintain a reverent attitude towards the truths God has revealed and the manifestations of His Presence, we shall be in danger of losing the controlling sense of the obligations of truthfulness and honour which lie at the heart of good and useful lives.

It is because of our recognition of these dangers, and because we fear that the tendencies we have indicated have, to a certain extent, been increased by some well-meant efforts to make the Faith attractive, that we very heartily welcome the publication of the Sermon preached by Dr. Bright at the Cuddesdon College Festival of this year. In this Sermon Dr. Bright points out that the present is a time in which there is much eager desire to stretch out a hand of sympathy to those who are unable entirely to accept the Faith.

'We long,' he says, 'perhaps impatiently, to remove all speculative difficulties; we not only admit, but eagerly assert, that the Faith, while unchangeable in itself, must speak to the men of this time, as of all times, "in their own tongue wherein they were born"; that it must, by a certain variety (of course, within certain limits) of exposition, explanation, or argument, convince them that it is no fossil of antiquated thought, but can deal with their own existing problems, and so make good the claim of Him on whom it rests to be the Christ of later as of earlier centuries, the inexhaustible Light that still, as formerly, can "lighten every one that cometh into the world" (pp. 6, 7).

Dr. Bright greets this desire with cordiality; 'it is meet and right;' but he adds an impressive warning:—

'We are weak creatures, even when we take a duty in hand: we do not always take hold of it on both sides. We forget that a hasty simplifying is apt to lead to a worse complication than ever. Expansiveness is an idea of the present hour; but should it not be balanced by the idea of fidelity to a trust? . . . There is nothing more pleasant than to sympathize; but sympathy, excellent as a servant, is not so excellent as a master. In things which concern revealed truth, it must be controlled and guided, and so kept really healthful, by a loyalty which, looking up to the Giver of truth, will steadily refuse to pare down His gift, to explain away this part of it, to keep back that other part as unwelcome to the "Time-spirit," and in that sense to "please men" without observing St. Paul's condition, "for their good, and so as to edify." Of course, the question whether this or that view or statement is essential to a particular doctrine, and therefore to be stood by at all costs, must in each case be decided according to proper evidence; but the judgment may be considerably affected by a habit of asking first, in all cases, whether the view or statement is likely to give offence, and so of assuming insensibly that, if it is, it is probably a distortion of the doctrine, and therefore ought to be readily laid aside' (pp. 7, 8).

This general warning is emphasized and explained by a number of illustrations of the way in which parts of the Faith may be surrendered with the idea of making it more acceptable. An outcry against 'Sacerdotalism,' or false notions about the ministry, may lead some

ts on icient ondly, to be

July

of an

of his

done.

comfering en the d the ink a very

ached
I. By
Regius
equest.
r own
oinion.

Faith of the on the to be uty of was so as the o great simply realizaendous involvrve the e cases cessive paid to

nue and nuected nue for ctarian' nink we of the oproach

¹ Rom. xv. 2.

to give up the true doctrine of Holy Orders as shown in our Lord's own commission to the Apostles and in the general teaching of the New Testament (pp. 8–10). Attacks on sacramental truth, frequently due to 'unconscious rationalism,' should be resisted 'by pointing to Christ Himself as the true efficient cause of those benefits which He thus instrumentally conveys' (pp. 10, 11). It is not to be forgotten that 'the historical Christ is the spiritual life-giving Christ,' and that it is essential to maintain a true view of miracles and prophecy.

'St. John's test of Christian "life," to "have" the Son of God, to be "in" Him, must be taken with his test of Christian belief, or rather, let us say, of union with God's Spirit, to "confess Jesus Christ as come in flesh." The "Son" is the Son as incarnate: and here we may observe that an excessive reaction from that dry and one-sided view of the evidence from His miracles, which isolated them from His teaching and character, has led some to forget that for those who could not at once accept Him for His own sake, and take Him simply at His own word, He did lay stress on those "signs" which He called "works done in the name of His Father;" and that if we disparage them, or "draw a veil over them," we so far derogate from His own authority when speaking in reference to His office as the Christ; even as, if we resolve predictive prophecy into the "forecast" of signally gifted souls, we shall be disabled from maintaining the infallibility of Christ as Teacher, and may find ourselves on a slope at the base of which is a residuum of Christianity, with the supernatural life crushed out of it' (pp. 11, 12).

The vital truth of the Atonement, the doctrine of the removal of an actual barrier between man and God by the Incarnate Son of God being the 'propitiation for our sins,' representing us, standing for us, His Godhead imparting 'a Divine efficacy to all that He did or suffered in His manhood,' is to be held fast.

""Vicarious"—" substitution"—" satisfaction"—we must not give up the use of these terms in a sense which is neither immoral nor arbitrary, but consonant to our Saviour's office as Second Adam, and involved in the very perfection of His own miraculous love' (pp. 13, 14).

And it is of the highest importance, while we emphasize 'our Lord's complete and veritable manhood,' that we should not forget the truth which we indicate by the phrase "Hypostatic Union."

'People may think they are contending for a truly human Christ, while what they are making for is a purely human Christ. . . At the lowest points of His self-humiliation, in the stable, in the garden, on the Cross, He was always Himself, possessing still, as God, the "form" or essential character of Deity. It is, I believe, on that side of the great doctrine which secures the permanence of His Godhead in the Incarnate, as involved in His undivided eternal personality, that we specially need to hold the balance true. If, while remembering Leo and Chalcedon, we forget Cyril and Ephesus, or rather, if we do not bear in mind that Chalcedon reaffirmed the teaching of Ephesus, we may come to take up with a strangely reversed form of the very heresy condemned at Chalcedon, as if, during His life on earth, our Saviour's Deity had been absorbed into His manhood' (pp. 15, 16).

fer in

189

shi mir

pas

ign

rightion to teach time of dist that the tire or

" m wish indepath and sym

for a facili on a for a closi

word stret mou

'limi carna huma See

¹ I St. John v. 12, 20; iv. 2. ² St. John x. 38.

⁸ Wace, The Gospel and its Witnesses, p. 97.

ord's

f the

ently ig to

n He

otten

that

to be

er, let me in

serve

f the

g and

once

vord,2

in the

a veil

aking lictive

abled

y find

ianity,

val of

on of

nding

Ie did

ive up

itrary,

ved in

'our

forget

, while

lowest

Cross, sential

octrine

, as in-

eed to

on, we

nd that ake up

t Chal-

d been

For the preaching and publication of all we have hitherto referred to we cannot be too heartily thankful. There is one passage in the Sermon about which we have a little doubt. It is this:-

'His human knowledge grew by stages, and even in His ministry it was not all-comprehensive; although, when He willed, His face could shine as the sun, and whenever He taught, explicitly or implicitly, His mind was flooded with the fullness of Divine light' (p. 15).

We understand Dr. Bright to accept the interpretation of two passages in the Gospels 1 according to which our Lord, as Man, was ignorant of some matters. Our own belief is that this is not the right interpretation of those passages; 2 but passing this by, we question whether there is ground for the distinction Dr. Bright appears to make between the human knowledge of our Lord when He was teaching 'explicitly or implicitly' and His human knowledge at other With the greatest diffidence in criticizing so great a master of the theology of the Incarnation, we would suggest that such a distinction has little to support it, and may have its dangers. Be that as it may, the value attached by Dr. Bright to the essential truth of our Lord's infallibility as a teacher, and to the bearing of that truth on all matters which His teaching touches, is made entirely plain by the emphatic words: 'whenever He taught, explicitly or implicitly, His mind was flooded with the fullness of Divine light.

The illustrations we have mentioned, and 'other instances of a "minimising" tendency, arising out of a sincere but unregulated wish to make the Christian Creed more acceptable' (p. 16), may indeed, as is pointed out, often make it hard to be faithful and sympathetic at the same time, but the examples of St. Paul and St. John and our Lord Himself are used to show that through faithfulness true

sympathy will be gained.

There may be many who not seldom have risen up from reading words written by Dr. Bright with gladdened hearts and new strength for the difficulties of the hour. The present Sermon, with all its bold facing of much which is disheartening, was appropriately preached on a day of rejoicing (see pp. 3-5), and we think some will thank us for calling attention to the encouraging thoughts which underlie the closing passage :-

'Let us first be loyal to our Master, and He will make us tender, considerate, equitable to our fellow-servants; perhaps will help us to say a word in season to those who are weary of searching for the light, to stretch out a helpful hand to those whose feet are stumbling on the dark mountains. Let us take up those words towards the close of a great

¹ St. Mark xiii. 22; St. Luke ii. 52.

² Compare pp. 508, 515, 516 of the present number. The mental 'limitation' in the human nature submitted to by our Lord in the Incarnation appears to have been, not ignorance of anything which the human mind can know, but the finite character of the human mind itself. See St. Thom. Aq., Summa Theologica, III. x. 1-3.

th

th

la

ai

of

to

th

gr

m

WI

H

th

the

an kn

life

an

kn

fro

nai

ex

fro

dog

ou

eac

and

nar

hymn, composed by the chief of scholastic theologians, himself a preacher whose deep fervour could move hearts:

"Bone Pastor, Panis vere,
Jesu, nostri miserere,
Tu nos pasce, nos tuere,
Tu nos bona fac videre
In terra viventium—
Tu qui cuncta scis et vales!"

Truly He knows all things, and can do all things. He understands, as we do not, the difficulties which we would fain relieve; and He knows us too as we do not know ourselves—our tendencies, in this or that point, to the falsehood of extremes, our clumsiness in handling so fine an instrument as His Word, and the manifold sins which make us so unfit to teach anyone in His Name. Let us beg Him to lead all wanderers to Himself by a straight way wherein they shall not stumble; and for ourselves, and for all whom He has made spokesmen of His truth, let us implore the power to respond to His intentions, to speak that truth alike faithfully and in love' (pp. 17, 18).

- I. How knoweth this Man Letters? An Enquiry into the Belief of the Church from the Beginning till now as to the Limitation of our Lord's Knowledge. A Letter to the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer, from the Rev. H. DE ROMESTIN, Warden of the House of Mercy, Great Maplestead. (London and Oxford: Parker and Co., 1891.)
- 2. The 'Advancement' of our Lord's Humanity. A Sermon preached at the Parish Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford, on the Second Sunday after the Epiphany, January 18, 1891. By HORACE E. CLAYTON, M.A., Vicar, Fellows' Chaplain and Divinity Lecturer of Magdalen College, Oxford. (Oxford: Bridge and Co., 1891.)

These are two of the many publications which show how great is the interest which has been excited by the controversy about the human knowledge of our Lord, and its bearing on the criticism of the Old Testament.

(1) Mr. De Romestin has compiled a very useful collection of passages from theological writers bearing on limitations of our Lord's knowledge. To this he has prefixed some interesting remarks in connexion with the publication of Lux Mundi. While recognizing that it is clear that each writer in this book 'has been animated by a real desire of promoting the truth and maintaining the Catholic Faith' (p. 3), there are some points, he says, besides the subject of his letter on which he wishes 'to make a gentle protest.' Among these he instances the adoption of that 'part of the spirit of this end of the nineteenth century' which is 'in a hurry,' which adopts 'theories before they are proved,' and jumps 'at conclusions before sufficient data are established on which to found them' (p. 4). He adds to this two thoughts of weight:—

'You must have noticed the entire alteration in the spirit of Oxford teaching since the changes of forty years ago. We used to be taught

nds, as knows t point, an inunfit to erers to

or our-

, let us

h alike

elief of nitation Carter, den of testin, London

eached on the r. By in and exford:

great is out the cism of llection

of our ting reWhile as been ntaining besides gentle part of s 'in a l jumps hich to ght:—

Oxford

e taught

that, whilst we might study all systems of philosophy, ancient or modern, there was such a thing as absolute truth, independent of human speculations, however nearly they might approximate to it. Truth was delivered to us; now men are encouraged to try to find it for themselves, and that often without the guiding star of Revelation. Hence the need of such attempts as those made by the writers of Lux Mundi, but one could wish their abilities and energies turned somewhat more decidedly to the establishing of the fact that above all fluctuating human opinion there sits enthroned on high the majestic figure of Eternal Truth' (pp. 4, 5).

The second point is hardly of less importance :-

'One cannot but think that some harm has arisen in this connexion from the late extensive study of German Protestant theology. Many of the writings of the various schools embraced under this head are valuable in their respective departments, but almost all require a thorough grounding in the Catholic Faith to make them safe, and even then are cautè legenda. Moehler showed years ago, in his Symbolik, how German Protestantism, even in its authoritative standards, is tainted on some fundamental points of doctrine, and there have been further individual departures in every direction since his death' (p. 5).

From the catena which follows it appears that among orthodox writers four different opinions have been held about the interpretation of the crucial passage, St. Mark xiii. 32:—

1. Our Lord, while knowing all things perfectly as God, was in His Humanity really ignorant of the time of His second coming, this ignorance being a voluntarily undergone part of the humility of the Incarnation.

2. Our Lord knew the time of His second coming both as God and as Man, but spoke of His not knowing because He did not know for the purpose of revealing it as a work of His Incarnate life.

3. Our Lord knew the time of His second coming both as God and as Man, but spoke of His not knowing because He did not know by the exercise of His human faculties, but by communication from His Divine nature.

4. Our Lord's meaning is that He does not know the time except by the communication to Him of that knowledge from the Father; this knowledge, like every other power of the Son, whether in His Divine or His human nature, being His Father's gift.

Each interpretation can claim the support of distinguished names; as also the important passage in St. Luke ii. 52 has been explained by some to indicate a growth in the actual knowledge in any way possessed by the human mind of our Lord, and by others to speak of a realization by experience of what was in reality known from the first. In the face of these differences it is not well to dogmatize as to the exact meaning of these particular texts, though our own preference is for the interpretation we have placed last in each case. These explanations of both the passages harmonize with and support one another; are, in our opinion, most easily consonant with the truth of the single Divine Personality of our Blessed

18

m

th

W

k

pa

W

b

t

Lord; and, in the case of St. Mark xiii. 32 the interpretation is suggested by the words 'the Son' (not 'the Son of Man'), is in accordance with the usage of Holy Scripture elsewhere,1 and is commended by the statement of St. Basil that he received it as the traditional belief.2 But what we desire to call attention to is that, whatever may have been thought as to the possibility of our Lord's ignorance as Man, the idea that He could ever, on any point, be mistaken, is as wholly alien to the tone and statements of the great writers of the Church as it is certainly precluded by the Church's condemnation of the heresy of Nestorianism. Therefore, a possibility of our Lord being ignorant, as Man, on matters of which He does not speak would in no way lessen His authority in anything He asserts or implies; and the significance of this truth is well pointed out by Mr. De Romestin where he says that, even if he thought that our Lord was subject to human ignorance, he

'certainly could not even then suppose it possible that our Lord could err, or deceive others, even indirectly, as to such matters of fact as David's authorship of Psalm cx., or the Flood, or Jonah's history' (p. 43).

We may add that we think the fact which Mr. De Romestin mentions, that those who deny that our Lord was ignorant of anything do not, with one or two unimportant exceptions, ascribe the infinity of God to the human nature of our Lord, but mean that as Man He knows all things which the human mind is capable of comprehending, is of importance.

If we may venture a word of criticism, we would ask whether the ascription of the *Quastiones ad orthodoxos* to Justin Martyr (p. 8) is intentional, or a slip of the pen.

(2) Mr. Clayton's Sermon emphasizes that our Lord 'did not by taking upon Him our flesh take to Himself a second Personality' (p. 2), and shows the bearing of this close union of the two natures in the one Person on the 'advancement' of His humanity and the infallibility of His words.

The feature of the Sermon which chiefly calls for notice is the directing of attention to the bearing of the sinless character of Christ's Manhood and of His Baptism on His human knowledge:—

'The ignorance of man as he now is, in a great measure, is the effect of sin; and the limitations of human knowledge are part of the punishment of man's first disobedience. The humanity of Adam, as originally created, was capable of an advance and of an intercourse with God, to which none of his descendants could in this life attain, by reason of an inherited sinfulness. But the humanity which our Lord took of His Virgin mother was in a position superior to that of Adam's, in that it was not only free from sin, but also incapable of sinning' (p. 3).

'One would suppose, that by the anointing of the Holy Ghost' (i.e. in His Baptism) 'the human wisdom of Jesus reached the utmost extent which man unchecked by sin could attain, and that He went forth among

¹ St. Matt. xx. 23; St. Mark x. 40; St. John vii. 16, xiv. 24.

³ St. Basil, Ep. 236 (al. 391).

men equipped with all the graces and powers which were needed for guiding men into God's truth' (p. 6).

We think Mr. Clayton is on surer ground when he is insisting on the necessary inferences from the single Personality of Christ, but these points need to be remembered in the consideration of the whole question.

The passage in St. Mark xiii. 32 is interpreted as showing that our Lord's 'humanity was limited in knowledge as to this particular,' but is not regarded as supporting a theory that He was ignorant of the history of the Old Testament times (p. 5), since it would not be for the benefit of man that He should so be ignorant, while there was a particular purpose in the withholding from His humanity the knowledge of the day of His second coming. As we have said in the earlier part of this notice, we do not think this the most likely interpretation of the passage, but it is well to observe that Mr. Clayton and others who so explain it agree with ourselves in believing that, e.g., the Davidic authorship of Psalm cx. is certified by our Lord. To ourselves it is clear that no view of our Lord's human knowledge which does not amount to a theory of His fallibility is of help towards setting aside the value of what He says about the Old Testament An opinion that, as Man, He possessed only the ordinary historical knowledge of His time, is either useless for such a purpose or must be pushed further to imply a possibility of mistake.1

Pseudepigrapha: an Account of certain Apocryphal Sacred Writings of the Jews and Early Christians. By the Rev. W. J. Deane. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1891.)

This is a collection of essays and articles on Apocryphal literature, the works selected for review being the Psalter of Solomon, Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Testaments of the Patriarchs, the Lepto-Genesis, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Sibylline Oracles. A brief critical history is given of each treatise, and this is followed by a summary of the contents, with a discussion of their value as records of Jewish thought and expressions of the hopes and aspirations of the nation. The Pseudepigrapha, though they bear fictitious names, are not to be classed with literary forgeries; and the disguise adopted by the authors is compared to the doubt which hangs over the origin of portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, such as the Psalms and Ecclesiastes. The discoveries of Ceriani in bringing to light the lost portions of the Assumption of Moses and the Apocalypse of Baruch are among the more recent additions to our stock of knowledge on the subject. Mr. Deane's tendency is, perhaps, to exaggerate the influence of the Pseudepigrapha, especially as compared with the prophetical portions of the Hebrew Canon. Hebrew Scriptures should be regarded as the chief source from which

¹ Consequently, it appears to us that the use of any theory of our Lord's ignorance for this purpose, although joined by some (as, e.g., by the writer on 'Inspiration' in the later editions of Lux Mundi) with express declarations of belief in His infallibility, is always fraught with the most serious danger.

could act as story

July

on is

is in

s the

that,

ord's mis-

great

irch's

ossi-

h He

g He

inted

anye the mean apable

nestin

Martyr not by nality' atures id the

is the hrist's

e effect ounishginally iod, to of an of His it was

st' (*i.e.* extent among

the writers of these books derived their inspiration. Their 'visions,' 'psalms,' or 'lyrics' are mostly adaptations of the thoughts of the older prophets and psalmists. The traces of New Testament teaching in the Pseudepigrapha are not so evident, especially in the case of the Apocalypse, which abounds throughout in the language of Hebrew prophecy. The doctrine of the Apocryphal writers adds but little to that of the great Hebrew prophets, and as an approach to the Gospel, or a preparation for it, falls far short of it. This is fully admitted by Mr. Deane, with regard to the character and office of the Messiah; but in his discussion on the 'Ascension' or 'trance' of Isaiah he finds parallels to this in 2 Cor. xii. 2-4 and Rev. i. 10, adding that no similar trance is recorded in the Old Testament: this seems to overlook the close parallel between Rev. iv. and Ezek. i., in both of which a door is opened and heaven displayed to the prophet's view; and the same character of vision occurs in Daniel. The tendency of Judaism after the close of the Hebrew Canon was rather retrogressive than progressive. It was slow to realize the hopes of the life to come as contained in Isaiah and Daniel, and reverted continually to the temporal promises of the law, and to the exaltation of the Jewish nation or polity. It was slow to apprehend the revelation of God's care for the Gentiles, as expressed in the prophets and vindicated by the Apostles of Christ; and even if the ideas concerning angels and demons were expanded, the authors were indebted for the best and purest of their conceptions to the Old Testament. Such part as the later Judaism had in preparing the way for the Gospel was by imparting the teaching of their sacred books, not by adding to it. The narrow spirit of exclusiveness pervades most of the Apocryphal writings, even the Wisdom of Solomon, which proclaims the care of God for all the souls which He has made, being not entirely exempt from it. These defects in the later Judaism as compared with ancient prophecy add a testimony to the Gospel as a new revelation. Its glory shone upon a dark world in which the possessors of the Divine oracles only held out a quivering light. 'The Gospel which I preached unto you is not of man' (Gal. i.). Mr. Deane's essays show a wide research, and bring out many features of deep interest in the Pseudepigrapha, but the unique authority of the Hebrew Scriptures perhaps required a fuller recognition. On p. 151 it is asserted that 'the received maxim among the Jews was that the whole world was comprised in Adam and sinned in his sin.' It is, however, doubtful whether the idea of 'inherited guilt' was included in the Rabbinical teaching concerning the 'evil invention' of the 'wicked heart' of man, which the Jewish authors, following Gen. viii. 21, asserted to be in man from his youth. None of the illustrations given by Bartoloccius, Bibliotheca Hebræa, tom. ii. p. 43, &c., point to such a conclusion. There are some minor inaccuracies, as in p. 30 the fragment prefixed to the Fourth Book of Esdras (ch. i.-ii.) is cited as part of the original treatise. On p. 31 'Mark' is printed for 'Matthew.' In the note on p. 202 the extract from the Lepto-Genesis, 'I will send them witnesses, and My witnesses they will slay,' might have been compared with St. Luke xi. 49. On p. 141 the

sto by ha the

Ac

18

wh me exa

for firs is e stu

dis

Co

so i

and into que life of life the of t Fag But por

tim

the

to r

Diz p. 4 As his 'nov 'a r Pur the

strik

July

ons,

the

achse of

but

h to fully

e of nce'

10,

this

., in

het's

ten-

ther

es of

con-

ation

vela-

and

con-

bted

nent.

the

ot by

st of

pro-

eing

m as

as a

the The

Mr.

es of

f the

t the

It is,

uded f the

viii.

istra-

&c.,

es, as

i.-ii.)

inted epto-

slay,

1 the

story of the concealment of the ark and precious things of the temple by angels is quoted from the *Apocalypse of Baruch*. There should have been a reference here to 2 Macc. ii. 4, 5, where the hiding of the ark is ascribed to Jeremy the prophet. On p. 271 we regret to see a doubt thrown upon the accuracy of St. Luke's narrative in the Acts, that Christ was seen by His disciples during a period of 'forty days.' We read with more satisfaction the passage (p. 85, &c.) in which the theory of the 'Evolution of Christianity,' that the New Testament writers drew largely from the *Book of Enoch*, is carefully examined and refuted.

 An Introduction to the Study of Dante. By John Addington Symonds. Second Edition. (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890.)

2. Dante and his Early Biographers. By EDWARD MOORE, D.D.

(London: Rivingtons, 1890.)

I. WE are not surprised to hear from Mr. Symonds that the demand for his book, both in England and America, continues, and that the first edition (published in 1872) has been long out of print; for it is extremely well adapted for its avowed purpose, viz. 'to make the study of Dante's works more easy to English readers.' Although it does not contain much that has not been said before, and although we are disposed to agree with Scartazzini, who (Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia, pp. 13, 14) places it in the category of historical romances so far as it deals with the narrative of Dante's life, it is full of thoughts and suggestions which throw a vivid light upon the poet's conceptions, and of judicious criticism of his style and merits. It begins with an interesting summary of early Italian history from the Lombard conquest of Italy; then taking us through the supposed events of Dante's life before and in exile. We say 'supposed,' because the statements of Boccaccio and other early biographers are assumed as in the main historical, whereas we think that Scartazzini has conclusively proved them to be unworthy of credit. Upon the moot question of the identity of the Veltro, Mr. Symonds is inclined to find him in Uguccione della Faggiuola rather than in Can Grande or in the Emperor Henry VII. But, in our opinion, there is much in the Divina Commedia which supports another theory which he advances, viz. that Dante was forced, as time went by, to see his Veltro grow more visionary and ideal. That the deliverer would appear he never doubted; but the man destined to realise the idea appeared not.

Very cursory reference is made to Dante's works other than the Divina Commedia. We own to some surprise at reading in the note to p. 41 that Mr. Symonds translates 'Vita Nuova' as 'Youthful Life.' As D'Ancona, Scartazzini, and others have pointed out, Dante gives his earliest work a Latin title. He says, 'Incipit Vita Nova.' Now 'novus' in Latin never bears the meaning 'youthful.' 'Vita Nova' is 'a new life'—a παλιγγενεσία, or regeneration. And 'vita nuova' in Purgatorio, xxx. 115, which Mr. Symonds quotes, no doubt refers to the book, and has, therefore, the same meaning. Perhaps the most striking part of his summary of the Vita Nuova is that in which he

contrasts the Love who appears to the poet in his visions with the old classical poets' embodiment of Love. The Convito is noticed as the work in which we see the idea of Philosophy taking form in Dante's essentially definite and picturesque imagination, and growing into life beside the image of Beatrice; thus preparing the way for the fusion of the living woman and the ideal mistress into the divine symbol of Theology which we find in the Divina Commedia. The chief interest of Mr. Symonds's Essay consists, however, in his discussion of the Divina Commedia, of which he says that it has only two peers in the whole domain of literature, viz. the Iliad and Paradise Lost; and that in the magnitude of its extent and the force of its vitality it surpasses one at least of them-the epic of Milton. At p. 105 he gives a description of the subject and scheme of the poem, founded upon Dante's own in the letter to Can Grande. 'The Divine Comedy is the Epic of Man, considered as a moral agent, exercising freewill under the eye of an inexorable Judge, who punishes and rewards according to fixed laws.' In the incidents of the first canto of the Inferno he sees a shadowing forth of 'the confusion of politics and factions in which Dante found himself during his priorate of 1300his vain attempts to regain the hill of civil order, which his city had neglected, and the opposition of Guelf Florence with her envy, of Guelf France with her pride, and of Guelf Rome with her avarice.' But he admits that we must not exclude the ethical interpretation required by the fact that it was Dante's own state of moral delinquency and error which induced Beatrice to grant him the vision. He then investigates and illustrates in detail the allegories which Dante uses more profusely in the Purgatorio than elsewhere, and which he divides into four heads-(1) an arbitrary selection of natural objects to designate spiritual things; (2) the use of material metaphors-e.g. the roughness of the roadway of repentance—to signify the qualities of immaterial existences; (3) the taking of some concrete person, animal or object, as the typical similitude of his thought; (4) the pictorial representation in a pageant, such as that which concludes the Purgatorio, of a long series of events. The allegorical significance to be given to Virgil and Beatrice is next considered. Unlike Scartazzini, in whose opinion Dante opposed the conception of unity to the various forms in which the dualism of the Middle Ages manifested itself, Mr. Symonds discovers this dualism in Dante himself. In his philosophy, mundane and celestial happiness were the two ends of man, and the Empire and the Papacy the two Divinely appointed systems for the temporal and spiritual welfare of mankind. In the same way Virgil is taken as the poet's guide as far as the terrestrial Paradise, the type of mundane felicity; he being the symbol of human wisdom, of Reason as distinct from Revelation. But for the ascent to heaven a Christian mystagogue is needed, who is found in Beatrice, 'the symbol of Divine Science, of Revelation as distinct from Reason, of Love superior to Skill.' Dante's progress with Virgil is the tardy process of the understanding on its pathway of experience; Beatrice's is the swift process of spiritual intuition, the child's faculty of faith and love, in which the understanding has no place. The different

man
The
poer
we fe
the i
of the
mort
Some

in co

just

frost-

1891

and self-regener lukewhis bein revand mess, beaut

but e

whom highly of the tonou blood the de fresh a light, a righter of hun and S Caccia

media, chief ca a wond remark vividno improve brevity the poor and of detailed world a definite is unique most sa

VO

July

the

ed as

n in wing

r the

ivine

chief

on of

ers in

and

ity it

os he

nded

medy

eewill

wards

of the

s and

300-

y had

vy, of

arice.'

tation

uency

e then

e uses

livides

cts to

s-e.g.

alities

erson,

4) the

cludes

ficance

cartaz-

to the

ifested

ends of

pointed

In the

rrestrial

ascent

eatrice,

Reason,

ne tardy

eatrice's

of faith

lifferent

manner in which Dante addresses his two guides is then dwelt upon. The fact that both of them are real as well as ideal persons in the poem renders their personality frigid. It detracts from the grief that we feel at the fate of the real Virgil in Limbo, and it makes us regard the real Beatrice, in her sermon against Dante's sins, her explanation of the spots on the moon, and her sublime contempt for the poet's mortal grossness, as a pretentious preacher or a stiff automaton. Some, perhaps, will think that Mr. Symonds goes rather too far when, in concluding this part of his subject, he tells us that, in order to be just to Dante, 'we must always bear in mind the exigencies of his frost-bitten allegory and his rigid methodistical theology.'

The human interest of the *Divina Commedia* is next discussed, and shown to centre in Dante's stern and vivid personality. His self-revelation has an ethical and didactic value. His sublime and generous anger, his satire, his severity, his hatred of treachery and lukewarm indifference, his liberality, his tender treatment of lovers, his boldness, his pride, his respect for noble ambition, are all passed in review and exemplified by quotations. So also are the softer and more amiable aspects of his character—his humility, his gentleness, his ecstasy of love and adoration, his patience in adversity, the beauty and tranquillity, the purity and celestial love of his soul.

The human interest of the poem is not, however, confined to him, but extends to the various individuals with whom he meets, and in whom he displays humanity piecemeal, as it were, in a succession of highly finished miniatures. But whereas the portraits and landscapes of the *Inferno* detach themselves from a background black and monotonous, illuminated only by the glare of flames and the red hue of blood, in the *Purgatorio*, we find ourselves in the free air of heaven; the decorations are studied and splendid, and the human interest is fresh and healthy. In the *Paradiso*, hope is swallowed in fruition; light, and love, and joy are one, a triune element of bliss in which the righteous spirits dance and sing. But even here there is abundance of human interest: witness Piccarda; the panegyrics of St. Francis and St. Dominic, sung by St. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura; Cacciaguida, &c.

Mr. Symonds, having completed his analysis of the *Divina Commedia*, devotes two chapters to the qualities of Dante's genius. The chief of these he considers to be definiteness, sincerity, intensity, and a wonderful faculty of vision. The breadth of his thought is less remarkable than its depth. His very parsimony of description adds vividness to the outline of his pictures. Not a single sentence is improvised; all have been framed by life-long meditation. Force, brevity, and subordination to fixed purposes are also conspicuous in the poem. The very structure and mechanism of the three *Cantiche* and of the cosmography of the three realms of the unseen world are detailed, precise, and complete. Even the smallness of scale in Dante's world adds to the impression which he gives us of its actuality. This definiteness determines the nature of his faculty of vision. In this he is unique. When he paints what he has seen or fancied he presents the most salient and striking point, and by vivid presentation of *that*, makes

VOL. XXXII.-NO. LXIV.

us see the whole. Sometimes he achieves vividness in description by referring to an actual scene. He has an extraordinary power of creating in the souls of his readers, by sympathy, the feelings which he describes as having stirred his own nature under particular circumstances. Mr. Symonds devotes a separate section to his similes, justly praising them for the exactness with which they suit the matter in question, so that they are never merely ornamental or conventional, like some of Homer's, but always to the point.

The paucity of instances of grotesqueness and obscurity, which Mr. Symonds adduces in support of his opinion that those are the chief faults of the poem, hardly, we think, suffice to prove the indictment.

Dante's sublimity is contrasted with that of Milton. Dante's is moral and not scenic, human and not abstract. Milton rejoiced in the abstract and indefinite, Dante in the concrete and detailed. Hence Milton's sublimity consists in the breadth and vastness of his pictures. When he descends to details he ceases to be sublime; but Dante wrings sublimity from his subject in spite of its detail and minuteness, his sublimity being sought for in the passions of the soul. Mr. Symonds happily suggests that this difference in the genius of the two poets may have been due in part to the blindness of Milton as contrasted with the keen-eyed vision of Dante. The latter has this in common with Shakespeare, that he rarely calls the vague and abstract and illimitable to his aid, but is always human, whereas Milton and Æschylus deal in Titanic ideas and superhuman conceptions. Taking an illustration from the sister art of painting, Mr. Symonds compares Michael Angelo and Fuseli to Milton; Orcagna and Blake to Dante. He considers also that Dante not only absorbed into himself and vocalised the painting of his age, but that he anticipated two centuries of the development of Italian sculpture.

The terza rima was a metre admirably suited to the poem. The lines 'are closely interlinked, like chain armour, so that the texture of the whole is durable and supple, combining the utmost elasticity with adamantine hardness' (p. 246). Mr. Symonds's assertion that 'to Italy the Divine Comedy gave a voice and language' can only be accepted with the modification pointed out by Scartazzini (Prolegomeni, p. 274), viz. that Dante made the Florentine and Tuscan

dialect from his time forth the language of all Italy.

An interesting dissertation upon the poetry of chivalrous love, which had its earliest interpreters in the Provençal troubadours, and gained increased depth of thought and feeling in the effusions of their successors, the Italian lyrists, culminating in the sonnets of Dante and Petrarch, concludes Mr. Symonds's volume. We commend this last chapter to the perusal of those who will be startled by Scartazzini's opinion that Dante's Beatrice can never have been a married woman, and, therefore, was not the daughter of Folco Portinari. And we strongly recommend the whole book to the attention, especially, of those who are beginning the study of the divine poet.

We notice an occasional slip of the pen, calling for correction in a third edition. Thus at p. 153 we are told that the lukewarm souls seem rece blood that p. I afflic puni were that

1891

66, 4 He a the C drove tation do so note lover. Nor i to a f

us so
Divin
been
of the
Vita a
and c
which
critics
the C
wheth
Th

Mario
Wi
who for
roman
biogra
tions
Dr. M
allegeo
record
of the
worthy
porarie

in his found in embass

otion er of hich cumniles, atter onal,

July

which chief nent. te's is oiced ailed. of his lime; il and e soul. ius of Milton er has ie and hereas a cong, Mr. rcagna

t only ut that lpture. asticity on that only be (Prole-Tuscan

is love, urs, and sions of nets of e comstartled ve been f Folco to the y of the

ection in rm souls seen in the vestibule of the Inferno, and not deemed worthy of reception within it, 'roam, bitten by flies and wasps, and shedding blood and tears which turn to loathly worms.' What Dante says is that the blood and tears are licked up by loathly worms. Again, at p. 160 the punishment of envy in Purgatory is described as the affliction of the eyesight with dense and acrid smoke. That was the punishment not of envy, but of anger. The eyes of the envious were sewn up with iron threads. They were deprived of vision by

that means and not by fog.

We are unable to accept Mr. Symonds's rendering of Inf. v. 65, 66, 'the great Achilles, who, for love's sake, fought at last' (p. 166). He adheres to the opinion which he had expressed in his Essay on the Greek Poets, that the love of Achilles for Patroclus, which finally drove him from his tent into the field, is referred to. This interpretation requires us to read with Fraticelli per amore for con amore. To do so is, we think, tantamount to the introduction of a discordant note into an harmonious melody. All the other instances of fated lovers adduced in the context are those of lovers properly so called. Nor is 'love' the word which the ancient Greeks would have applied to a friendship, however ardent, between man and man.

2. Dr. Moore's Dante and his Early Biographers does not impress us so favourably as his former work on the Time References in the Divina Commedia. His main object in publishing it appears to have been the discussion in English of the authorship and mutual relation of the two forms of the Life of Dante attributed to Boccaccio-the Vita and the Compendio. This subject he treats with much learning and critical discrimination; but, as he arrives at the same conclusion which had already been reached by the eminent German and Italian critics whom he enumerates at p. 7-viz. that the Vita is genuine and the Compendio spurious, i.e. an unauthorised rifacimento—we doubt whether it was worth his while to reopen the question.

The biographers whose works he analyzes are five, viz. Boccaccio, Filippo Villani, Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti, and Giovanni

Mario Filelfo.

With regard to Boccaccio, he joins direct issue with Scartazzini, who follows Leonardo Bruni in saying that his Life is a poem or romance, not a history. He lays stress, on the other hand, upon this biographer's opportunities for information, and his special qualifications from actual intercourse with friends and relations of Dante. Dr. Moore does not, however, seem to pin his faith to all the facts alleged by Boccaccio, but trusts him mainly upon such details as he records of the features, gait, habits, manners, and other personal traits of the poet, and which, in Dr. Moore's opinion, give a generally trustworthy and truthful picture of Dante as he appeared to his contemporaries and as he lived in the memories of his fellow-men.

Filippo Villani, nephew of the celebrated chronicler Giovanni, in his meagre Life, written in Latin, gives very little not already found more fully in Boccaccio, except the story of Dante's Venetian embassy from Ravenna, upon which he caught his last illness.

1

tl

m

na

w

fre

tii

cle

he

ca

us

sh

fro

ide

fro

bel

an

ser

abi

am

hav life

true

the

abs

thro

Gho

offe

one

Gho

Div

hear

of g

liver

The

Leonardo Bruni (born in 1369 and dying in 1444) begins his Life of Dante by recording his disapproval of Boccaccio's, written about half a century before. He says that Boccaccio seems to write with the idea that a man is born into the world for nothing else but to qualify himself for a place in the Decameron. In this opinion, as we have seen, Dr. Moore does not concur. Leonardo's Life, however, recommends itself to him as the work of a serious and intelligent historian, who avoids gossip and mere current tradition, and knows how to make use of letters, archives, and documents to verify or test his statements—and all this without becoming dull. Dr. Moore has a fellow-feeling with him as being a distinguished Aristotelian. He notices as singular that Leonardo omits all mention of the Vitar Nuova and the Convito.

Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) is characterized as having written a prolix and pretentious work, its only feature of originality being displayed in the inventive enterprise of the author; the rest being a mere réchauffé of Boccaccio and Leonardo, with occasional scraps from Villani.

Filelfo (1426–1480) wrote soon after the middle of the fifteenth century, but his work, written, like that of Manetti, in Latin, was never published till 1828—in Florence. Dr. Moore agrees with the Marchese Trivulzio, quoted and endorsed by Scartazzini, Vita di Dante (Hoepli's series), p. 8, that 'to quote Filelfo as an authority for any statement would be no less ridiculous than an appeal to Don Ouixote in confirmation of an historical fact.'

After briefly discussing other early biographical notices of Dante, Dr. Moore puts together the personal traits and characteristics of the poet, gathered from his biographers and illustrated by passages in his own writings. This compendium has the merit of placing succinctly before the reader materials at hand to all students, though somewhat widely scattered.

The chief use of this little book is, we think, that it enables anyone to collate the statements in the different Lives and the grounds on which they are based, which are all carefully analysed, and so to become better qualified to judge how far the facts which they relate may or may not claim to be historically true.

Why I Left Congregationalism. By GEORGE SALE REANY (late Congregational Minister), Assistant Curate of St. Mary's, Riverhead, Kent. (London: James Clark and Co., 1890.)

My Salvation Army Experience. By the Rev. WYNDHAM S. HEATH-COTE, B.A., Oxon. Four years an Officer in the Salvation Army. (London: Marshall Brothers.)

WE couple these little books together, for there is a striking connexion between them. Each of them recounts the reasons for return to the Church of England which have influenced a religious mind that had tried to find its rest in a sect. In their descriptions of the religious life of the communities they have left they are alike full of interest and obviously truthful. In neither is there the least tendency to throw any dirt at the abandoned faith. On the contrary, we have

ns his
written
o write
se but
ion, as
wever,
elligent
knows

n. He ne Vita written y being

being a

or test

ore has

ifteenth in, was with the Vita di uthority to Don

f Dante, cs of the res in his accinctly omewhat

oles anygrounds nd so to ley relate

NY (late 's, River-

HEATHon Army.

king confor return ous mind ons of the ike full of tendency we have experienced in both cases a distinct increase of respect for our separated brethren, and a better appreciation of the charm which they find in the form of religion which they prefer. We wish that those who have left us for Rome were always as gentle in their talk about us as these priests are in their accounts of the communities from which they have parted. If they were, our Roman friends might have reason to think that they understood something about

our position and our religious life.

A Churchman will not rise from the perusal of either work with too strong a sense of the merits of himself or his brethren. On the contrary, it is the practical defects of our administration that originally lost us these valuable members; and they come back to us now with admonition and advice as to what we can do to keep others from the errors which so long deceived them. We hope that in the times to come the Church will have risen to the greatness of her calling, and that the practical efficiency of her work, as well as the closer truth of her system to the Divine pattern, will operate to call her scattered children home. If we may judge from these two cases, nothing is needed but that she should be true to herself and use the instruments which God puts into her hands, in order to show the sects their own ideal far better realized than they are able to show it themselves.

I. The Congregational ideal is expressed by Mr. Reany in extracts from the accredited divines of the body. Dr. Conder says: 'The idea of a Congregational Church, an Apostolic Church, we find from the New Testament was just a fellowship of persons who had believed the glad tidings, accepted Jesus as their Lord and Saviour, and openly joined the brotherhood of those consecrated to His service.' But the fullest statement comes from Dr. Dale, whose abilities and earnestness are known within the Church as well as

among his own people.

'Every Congregational church consists of those, and of those only, who have received through Christ remission of sins and the gift of the Divine life, and to whom the will of Christ is the Divine law. In a sense it is true, no doubt, that Congregational churches assert with great emphasis the principle of Individualism; for we maintain that every man receives absolution of sin, not through the ministry of a human priesthood, but direct from the life of God; and that the Divine life is given, not through Sacraments, but by the immediate inspiration of the Holy To be at a church-meeting-apart from any prayer that is offered, any hymn that is sung, any words that are spoken-is to me one of the chief means of grace. To know that I am surrounded by men and women who dwell in God, who have received the Holy Ghost, with whom I am to share the eternal righteousness and eternal rapture of the great life to come—this is blessedness. I breathe a Divine air; I am in the New Jerusalem which has come down out of heaven from God, and the nations of the saved are walking in its streets of gold. I rejoice with the joy of Christ over those whom He has delivered from eternal death and lifted into the light and glory of God. The church is a Divine society.'

These are eloquent words; but to us they are spoiled by their

18

tw

B

wl

he

ye

sp

up

ha

ha

inf

M

Ha

eva

de be

wil

cla

suc has

do

ha

Me

all

the

ear

the

tak

Mı

Ar

pre

nex the

and

use

me

'H

the

chi

and

sho

lose

extravagance. If a Churchman would take such words into his mouth he must imagine himself in the Christian assembly with all the sacramental pledges of Christ's presence as a real outward fact removed, and the proof of It thrown upon the subjective experience of the human souls engaged in worship. The ministry loses its commission and its power as a link with Christ; absolution from sins is received, not through a human priesthood, but direct from the life of God; and the Divine life is given, not through Sacraments, but by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And all this although the Lord's own high priesthood is a human one as well as Divine, and it is as the Son of Man that He hath power on earth to forgive sins; and although He said to His Apostles, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them;' and although in the context of that very promise to be with the two or three assembled in His name which the Congregationalists regard as their charter, He says, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and although it was by His breath, by the laying on of His Apostles' hands, or by the Sacraments ordained by Him and used by them, that the Holy Ghost was given in the Apostolic Church. God forbid that we should deny that the life of God, infused direct from Him by the Holy Ghost, is the only true life of the soul. But while the life is direct and immediate, our knowledge of it must evidently come by media. The good lives by which Dr. Dale himself judges that those with whom he is assembled dwell in God are to him sacramental media of reaching the life of God as much as the Holy Eucharist is to us. Now we should find it something appalling to imagine that anybody was looking to anything so miserably imperfect as our lives or our worship for proof of the presence of Christ. Can Dr. Dale bear to think that his fellow-worshippers look in their turn to his personal holiness for the proof of the Divine Presence? The silent influence of praying friends is indeed great, but it must not be turned into a sacrament. It has none of the definite certainty which we find in 'Take eat, this is My Body.' If we use it as our only means of assuring ourselves of the Real Presence of our Lord, it is impossible but that we should conceive other people also looking to us to assure them of the same Presence. And then the whole attitude of our minds is changed from devotion to introspection. Instead of resting in self-forgetful assurance upon 'a Presence of Christ' pledged from without, we must find in our subjective feelings not only the enjoyment of the Presence, but the proof of it, and every man must be his

We may leave the reader to find for himself, from Mr. Reany's interesting narrative, how far short the Congregational reality falls of the Congregational ideal. It is not that the people with whom he had to do were specially careless; he seems to have known but little of the defects which 'Salem Chapel' reveals to us. The failure of Congregationalism to reach its ideal of devotion was only what has been seen in the Church ten thousand times. But when Congregationalism fails to reach its ideal of devotion the sacramental sign of the Lord's presence, which consists in the true conversion of the

nto his

with all

ard fact

e expe-

ry loses

on from

rom the

aments,

all this

well as

earth to

ever sins

ntext of

is name Whatso-

lthough

ls, or by he Holy that we

n by the

e life is

come by

at those

amental

ucharist

gine that our lives

Dr. Dale

n to his

he silent

e turned

we find

neans of

possible

o assure

e of our

of resting

ged from

e enjoy-

st be his

Reany's

lity falls

th whom

own but

ne failure

nly what

en Con-

ramental

on of the

two or three, departs also. The Church may be false to her own ideal. But though she believe not, her Lord abideth faithful and cannot deny Himself. And His presence in the midst of her remains sure whether to condemn her as guilty of His Body and Blood, or to help her to a better mind.

2. It is no small testimony to the Salvation Army that it should have been able to enlist and to retain for no less a period than four years so intelligent and devout a person as Mr. Heathcote. He speaks with the fullest information, and we place complete reliance upon his estimate of the sources and amount of the success which has attended the Army. As it is assumed in some quarters that it has got hold of the masses, we give at the outset Mr. Heathcote's information on this point:—

'Has the Army, then, solved the problem of how to reach the masses? My answer is, after four years' experience of its work, Most certainly no! Has the Army accomplished any real and appreciable and permanent evangelistic work at all? I answer, Yes! in certain parts, but not in the densely crowded centres of population. The Salvation Army has not been a success in the East End of London, for instance, or in Birmingham and the black country, in Liverpool, Manchester, &c.; in fact, with one or two exceptions, such as Oldham, the big towns are untouched and will remain so. The village problem is one which the Army can scarcely claim to have satisfactorily dealt with. On the other hand, in some parts of London, and in some provincial towns, and in some foreign countries, such as Canada and Australia (the latter especially), a very good work has been done' (pp. 33-4).

The Army is not founded, like Congregationalism, upon a new doctrine, ecclesiastical or religious. Mr. Heathcote believes it to have inherited much from the Society of Friends and much from the Methodists: from the one the idea of a Christianity separated from all ecclesiastical forms, and from the other the open-air appeals to the crowd. And no doubt these important movements, with their early struggles and their final successes, taught the nation to tolerate the ideas which they represented, and made it possible for others to take up their methods without fighting the battle over again. But Mr. Heathcote is of opinion that the element of Jesuitism in the Army is more important than either of the others in insuring its present success, and insuring also its final ruin.

He does not mean, to be sure, that there is any historical connexion between the Society of Jesus and the Salvation Army. But there is an undeniable parallel between the mixture of self-devotion and shrewdness, of indifference to worldly objects and unscrupulous use of worldly means, which are to be found both in the one movement and in the other. We conceive the authors of both exclaiming, 'How slow are the methods of the old Church! What a large part of the world is left outside its influence! How much wiser are the children of this world in advancing their cause than is the Church! and if the Church takes up the methods of the world, as it has often shown itself willing enough to do, it becomes worldly and wicked, and loses both the power over its own instruments and the credit with the

1

16

C

0

S

A

b

al

re

ti

fu

tic

po

th

le

ex

T

th

th

th

Co

ide

me

gu

Pr

ass

nei

world which belongs to its heavenly faith. What if we could organize a system possessing the enthusiasm and self-sacrifice that can only come from the deepest and most spiritual faith, accompanied by the impatience of inefficiency and the willingness to use the instruments which come to hand that belong to those who mean to succeed in the world?' It is an alliance between the powers of this world and of the next which may well recommend itself to ardent souls, though the calm ineffective people who have neither the longing nor the power to be going forward may easily discern its dangers and defects. One of its defects certainly lies in the temptation to assume an appearance of success which is not verified by the reality of things. Jesuitism, like the Army, has had the reputation of an influence which awoke awe in the weak-minded and opposition in the strong; but it has really ruined every kingdom and every interest which ever submitted to its guidance.

The Salvation Army is entering now upon a course of secular administration. The powers which it must propitiate and control are not indeed those of the court and the boudoir, with which the Jesuits dealt, but those of the social and political world. And if it loses its first impulse of spiritual enthusiasm and becomes secular, as Jesuitism did, it will fall still more surely than Jesuitism. For it will not have behind it a power like the papacy to support it by an ancient prestige. The Army has no such defences behind which to retire and renew its formation if, as armies will do, it loses its spiritual impulse and its confidence. Mr. Heathcote tells us (p. 57) how the spiritual aims of the Army are brought to the support of its earthly system:—

'The changes are rung upon the expressions "Loyalty to Jesus Christ," "Loyalty to the Army," and "Loyalty to the family" [of Booth]. The one is substituted so rapidly for the other that the ordinary enthusiastic but thoughtless soul is soon taught to believe that "loyalty to the family" is really "loyalty to Jesus Christ." . . . At the same time this is one of the saddest features of the whole system. It creates a false conscience amongst its members—a conscience to man rather than God.'

The very indictment which the Provincial Letters laid against the Jesuits.

Another interesting chapter of Mr. Heathcote's little work is the fifth, in which he treats of 'the Army and the Sacraments.' Salvationists owe their whole success to the power they have shown to embody religion in a visible form, while so many of the sects were boasting an unreal spirituality. Why, then, have they declined to use those sacramental ordinances in which the Lord provided for this very necessity, and in which the Church through every age has maintained at once its visible existence and its union with an invisible Head as one Body and one Spirit?

Mr. Heathcote himself believes that it is the providence of God which has kept back the Army from that profanation of the Sacraments which would have been sure to ensue from their adoption into its system. For our part, we fear that in the future developments of the Army this obvious gap in the completeness of its equipment

July

ild ornat can

panied instru-

o suc-

s world

souls,

ng nor

ers and assume

things.

e which

but it

er sub-

secular

control

ich the

And if

secular, For it

it by an

hich to

oses its

(p. 57)

to Jesus

Booth].
y enthu-

ty to the

alse con-

inst the

rk is the

Salva-

hown to

cts were

d to use

for this

as maininvisible

of God ne Sacra-

God.'

may be supplied by some kind of mock Sacraments, just as the Wesleyans manufactured a ministry, though their founder was so long content with that of the Church. But, meanwhile, how is the want of Sacraments supplied in the Salvation Army? Baptism is represented by prayer for the child and the waving of the flag of the Army over him; while the absence of the Holy Eucharist is supplied by repeated approaches to the penitent-form in order to receive the blessing of a clean heart: although, according to the obvious meaning and intention of this ceremony, it is not meant to be systematically repeated. It is impossible to believe that such bald rites will continue to satisfy earnest souls when contrasted with those ordinances, so full of exquisite beauty, which carry with them the promise of grace sanctioned by the Lord's institution and nigh two thousand years of Christian experience.

Natural Theology and Modern Thought. The Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin, 1888-9. By James Houghton Kennedy, B.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.)

THE Donnellan Lectures do not appear from the press invested with the typographical glories of the Bampton. But Mr. Kennedy's work reaches so high a standard that it would not discredit any foundation. It supposes, indeed, that the reader is interested in enquiries of an abstract character. But to minds of this class it offers no difficulties in comprehension which clear thinking and a lucid style can overcome. It aims at proving that modern thought has not over-

powered the proofs of natural theology.

The first lecture is entitled 'The Veto of Positivism,' and deals with the notion which troubles so many in these times, that the knowledge of the supernatural is in the very nature of things denied to man. The lecturer argues upon this subject that our acquisition of knowledge of any sort involves startling additions to what we should have expected its scope to be if we had allowed materialism to define it. The study of the stars and of books alike conduct us far beyond that consciousness of a disturbance in our nerves or of modulations in the ether, which are the material antecedents of our ideas on these subjects; to objects inconceivably distant in space, or to the thoughts of men who died a thousand years ago. Accordingly Comte, as a consistent Positivist, proposed to abolish not merely the ideas of metaphysics and religion, but also the very use of the word Force, because it expresses something which is not a phenomenon. Yet this word and many others equally beyond the world of matter are the indispensable instruments of modern scientific lan-

The luminiferous æther is manifested to no organ of sense; but Professor Tyndall defends himself for allowing it a place in his science, on the principle that when we lay it down that light moves as if there was a luminiferous æther that is the utmost that we can assert of any practical fact in life. You cannot prove that your neighbours are reasonable beings. All you know is that if you treat

tion into lopments uipment

fi

ir

w

pi

pe

nı

de

in

ac

th

(p.

Er

M

sch

rep

alle

qu

giv

alle

for

them as if they were, you find it answer. 'This,' rejoins Mr. Kennedy, 'is exactly the kind of evidence by means of which the Physico-Theological argument seeks from the phenomena of nature to infer the existence of an intelligent Author of Nature' (p. 26).

The second lecture treats of Design and Mechanical Causation. The celebrated German physiologist, Du Bois Reymond, declares the goal of physical science to be the reduction of all changes in the material world to the movements of atoms; the material world being the only world which he recognizes. A mind such as Laplace imagined, acquainted with all the forces of nature and the position of the atoms which compose it, ought, according to him, to be able to foretell all future events, whether mental or physical, as the astronomer can predict the future position of a comet. But even if this ideal of science could be reached there would remain, says Du Bois Reymond, three great barriers to its complete triumph. One is the impossibility of conceiving the individual atoms; the second the impossibility of accounting for the origin of motion; and the third the impossibility of tracing the origin of consciousness; because the proposition, 'Consciousness is bound up with material conditions,' is quite different from the proposition, 'Consciousness can be mechanically explained.' Another treatise by the same learned author lays down seven enigmas, three of which are found in the existence of the three essential limits to knowledge just named, while the four others, though unsolved at present, may, he hopes, be solved in the future. Among these unsolved but possibly soluble questions the Appearance of Design in Nature stands. For an explanation of this he looks hopefully to Darwin's theory, which he regards as the only plank which can save him from destruction; as if, forsooth, salvation consisted in the ability to expel from the mind all belief in an overruling Mind and destruction in being forced to recognize it. Many will think that the truth lies the other way. However, the enigmas of Du Bois Reymond cease to be enigmas for the believer in God. And this solution of his perplexity seems so obvious a resource, that the confession of the existence of the difficulty has brought upon this illustrious man of science as much reprobation from the materialists as if he had adopted the supernatural solution himself.

As for the 'way out' which some of Du Bois Reymond's critics suppose themselves to have found, in the absolute identification of our ideas with the movements of the molecules of the brain, Mr. Kennedy has no difficulty in proving that this statement of the case issues, not in materialism, but in idealism. 'If ideas are motions of matter the converse statement can no longer be resisted that these same motions of matter are ideas' (p. 68). Now we can obviously only know matter as an idea. Therefore the statement that matter is an idea necessarily takes precedence of the statement that an idea is matter. Haeckel proposes to resolve the difficulty by laying down that each atom has inherent in it a certain quantity of force and is in this sense endowed with a soul. But force and soul are indubitably ideas and not matter, and Mr. Kennedy has manifest reason on his side when he contends that 'the necessary development of this theory

July

edy.

sico-

infer

tion.

s the

the

eing

ima-

f the

fore-

omer

al of

ond,

bility

ty of

bility

tion,

erent

ned.'

mas,

imits

ed at

e un-

n in

ly to

save

bility

struc-

truth

mond

of his

ne ex-

ience

d the

critics

ion of

, Mr.

e case

ons of

these

iously

natter

n idea

down

d is in

oitably

on his

theory

would be the recognition of will as the original cause and explanation of all material phenomena' (p. 71).

We should like to extract, did our space allow it, the clever passage in which the lecturer proves that Leibnitz's theory of a preestablished harmony between the equally independent movements of mind and matter agrees far better with the doctrine of the conservation of energy than that of modern physical science, which regards the mental series as dependent on the material. But the point to which his lecture is specially devoted is the proof that our perception of the connexion between mental antecedents and their consequents is far closer than between physical antecedents and theirs, since it enables us to predict. It is mental antecedents which enable the painter or musician to foresee what the result of his work will be. There is plainly in these cases that likeness between the antecedent and the consequent, the absence of which in the physical series was so fully admitted by Hume. It is upon the mental series that all our improvements in knowledge depend, and the doctrine of automatism, were it really believed, would place a barrier to the progress of physical science itself, which idealism, though never so firmly credited, could never erect. 'However anxious we may be to harmonize the mental and physical causal series, the desired harmony cannot be attained by denying the causal chain for which we have the stronger proof' (p. 99).

The parallel between the mind perceiving and the will acting is perfect. When we perceive a distant object we pass over the innumerable molecular movements which intervene between it and our perception of it, and when we form a design to be realized hereafter we neglect, as things of which we have no knowledge, the equally innumerable molecular movements which will interpose between the design and the fulfilment. And if there be room for the human intellect and the human will to act the part of true causes in human action, and oblige us to recognize design as a real and operative principle in human history, 'the inference will be irresistible that there must be room everywhere else for design to work, and the only question will be, Have we evidence for the existence of design?'

(p. 105).

This evidence of design Mr. Kennedy seeks chiefly in the attractive region of the beautiful. And in doing so he finds his chief opponent in the illustrious Kant, whose opinions on some parts of the subject he cannot find to have been hitherto examined by any English author. We believe that in all the beliefs which he asserts Mr. Kennedy is right. But we are not quite so sure whether Kantian scholars would allow that in all cases their master has been completely represented. The question whether Kant really, and in sober fact, allows the noumenon an entrance into the circle of actual things is a question among his successors to this very day. And upon the answer given to it will turn the point whether it is enough to say that Kant allows to the moral proof of God's existence, implied in the exercise of our moral nature, a merely subjective validity. But it is easier for us to say what we ourselves believe than to discuss the question

no

an

of

life

an

thi

wh

ins

the

the

go

to

be

wh

Br

car

vai

the

ins

ope

As

vie

tion

wit

His

whether it agrees with Kant or no. And we certainly find on the one hand a proof of the existence and action of God in the categorical imperative of our conscience, which no amount of argument upon the marks of design in nature, however true in its own limited sphere, could have supplied to us; and we find this idea of God, as reached from conscience within, to be more independent of circumstances, and therefore less purely subjective, than any conception of Him which can be reached by argument. All efforts to embody the moral ideal in palpable and living form must be the result of design and effort, whether the design and effort of God in creation and providence or of ourselves in human action. But above all our designs, and even above His, presides the unattained and eternal idea of infinite

perfection.

It would seem to us that the law of beauty partakes of the same character. Beauty in art cannot, as Mr. Kennedy well argues, exist without design. But the design does not create the beauty although it helps us to notice it, and, as it were, directs our attention to it through sympathy with the effort which has been used to express Thus if Kant's theory may be explained to mean that the sense of beauty is 'a spirit still more deeply interfused' in the works of nature and of man-something which design and all other processes which our understanding can grasp aspire after, but cannot create we think him right. He might well deny purpose to be the cause of beauty if his meaning be that the source of beauty must be supposed and aimed at as the foundation of purpose. But he seems to proceed further and deny that the purpose of God aims at embodying beauty, and that it assists us to feel the sense of it. And if this be his whole meaning, we thoroughly agree with Mr. Kennedy that he deeply errs. We are also at one with the lecturer in representing our sense of the sublime as not merely what Kant supposes, a subjective feeling depending on nothing external. But does not Kant's very proof of this imply something more than a merely subjective source. feeling of the sublime, according to him, is derived from a sensation of pain caused by the inability of our power of imagination to form an estimate of some object, and then a superinduced sensation of pleasure at the proof thus given of the disproportion between the greatest power of sense-perception and the ideas of the reason. A profound analysis indeed. But are the ideas of the reason purely subjective? Are they not rather those ideas which force themselves upon us as coming from something beyond ourselves and our experiences? And is it not for that reason that the sense of sublimity in nature or in human life invariably uplifts the mind towards God? Our only criticism, then, on Mr. Kennedy's concluding lectures would be that perhaps he has assumed a too hostile attitude towards Kant, and that there may be more agreement between them than he supposes. But we cannot anywhere find that the lecturer has committed himself to an erroneous view; everywhere the enquirer will find the most suggestive thoughts and the fairest and fullest discussion. We can promise all interested in such matters a treat of no mean order in the perusal of the book. And, after all, if persons are

1 104

XUM

July

one

rical

n the

here.

ched

nces.

Him

noral

and

lence , and

finite

same

gues,

eauty

ntion

press

sense

ks of cesses

ate-

use of

posed

dying his be

ng our

ective

proof

sation

form

ion of

en the

n. A

purely

selves

our ex-

God?

ectures

owards

han he

s com-

rer will

est dis-

t of no

The

not interested in such subjects, they ought to be. For, although the principles for which Mr. Kennedy contends may not be capable of direct and immediate application to practice, they lie not far off it; and the opposite principles are capable of the most immediate effect in checking both devotion and work. What question more worthy of man's best powers can there be than that which asks whether spirit or matter, blind chance or purpose, rules the world and human life?

From King to King: the Tragedy of the Puritan Revolution. By G. Lowes Dickinson, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (London and Orpington: George Allen, 1891.)

From King to King is a series of dramatic sketches, some in prose and some in verse, covering the period from the last imprisonment of Eliot in the Tower, in 1632, to the death of Vane on the scaffold thirty years later. The object of the author is to depict the tragedy which lies 'in the conflict of reforming energy with actual men and institutions;' 'to delineate vividly the characters of leading actors in the struggle, their ideals, and the distortion of these as reflected in the current of events.' The idea is a fine one, and the execution good. Of course, all the scenes are not of equal merit. It was rash to put words, and especially verse, into the mouth of Milton; without being hard on Mr. Dickinson one may say that the comparison is crushing. Similarly, though not to an equal extent, the scene in which Strafford appears suffers from the inevitable comparison with Browning's powerful play. The conversations in the Parliamentary camp after Naseby, though skilfully expressing the divergent views of various sections of the conquerors, are not good as dramatic dialogue; they are too obviously written with a purpose. But the historical insight of the author is acute, the verse is always good and often fine, and the characters are, for the most part, clearly portrayed. opening lines of the volume, spoken by Eliot in the Tower, are as good as could be wished.

'Yes, I grow pale! A breath of Cornish air Would make this Tower a Heaven! Suppose the sea Beat at its dripping base, and winds in tumult With clang of birds and sailing foam-drift sang Shrill by the cliffs and turrets; suppose Tintagel Had been my prison, and yonder slit revealed The huge Atlantic heaving, sun and cloud, Moisture and ocean fragrance! Suppose, suppose. . . .'

It is not very often that Mr. Dickinson lets himself go in this fashion. As a rule he is somewhat dominated by his anxiety to express his view of the history of the period he is describing. With his conception of that history we have little fault to find. He has sympathy with the great men of both parties, though very little for the king. His idea of Strafford is expressed in the words of Greenwood, Strafford's tutor:—

Cromwell.

'I think the Earl of Strafford, The greatest man alive, deserves to die.

They banished Aristides for his justice, And Strafford's loyalty may deserve the scaffold.'

The position of Cromwell, especially in the closing years of his life, is expressed in more than one fine scene, and the conversation between the Lord Protector and Sir Henry Vane is perhaps the best piece in the volume. Certainly it is the one in which the tragedy of the conflict between men and ideals is most clearly and most forcibly expressed. Vane charges the Protector with his despotism, with being a mere 'illegitimate Charles.'

Cromwell. 'You shall not vex me, Harry. I will not answer, Or not at present; tell me of yourself.

My lord, 'twas England's business brought me here. My lord, my lord! Why then, Sir Henry Vane, You came to speak to me of such a people As from Algerian sands to these white shores Has swept the sea of pirates; taught Savoy That not unmarked in the Waldensien vales The blood of saints crimsoned his Alpine snows, And, far as Santa Cruz, to Spanish papists Witnessed a power as proud as once of old For cause so good, to shatter as empty shells Their huge and ocean-chafing armaments.

'Vane, Vane, I lead no party, I lead the cause! And if I lead, not follow, that's from God, And under God! 'Twere madness to deny it.
Where could I stop? How without harm retire, Or take the second place? From step to step I was impelled; to question meant destruction-Not mine alone, but England's! Think of it! If I have erred—I have; what man has not? I know I must have, often, greatly! Yes, But not as you think, not in purpose, never!
And let me tell you, Vane—you ought to know it—
There's more to mar our ends than human error; The grain of the world is curst; there's flaws and knots; Plane as you will you'll never plane it even. It's hard to blame the workman. . . Harry, my daughter's lately dead, and since This burden's breaking me; what use in words? Doubtless there's much to blame, and much to urge In fair extenuation, but not now!' (p. 114).

And then, when Vane, still unreconciled, departs-

Cromwell.

'Vane too, Vane too! Yet, while I live, a thousand such as Vane Shall never shake the power not I, but God, Set up to quell his foes! And when I die (Which must be soon, so dissolution loads My spark of life with ashes) putting off

be WO sai the lite M

18

July

tiv El

TH

suc and sor ain me ne effe thi ess wh it c

the mo fac kne offi tro and

cer

Mr

tive not act der fact fact

niz

July

life,

be-

best

ly of

cibly

with

This weary, battered, too-perplexed being,
I'll dare expect, not owed but given of grace,
E'en to desert so small, the consummation
That stills at last this riddling sphinx of pain,
And rounds with heaven so jagged a world as ours.
But oh, my brother Vane, alas! my brother!

These quotations may seem unduly long, but they illustrate, better than mere description can do, the quality of Mr. Dickinson's work. A captious critic might suggest that Preston Pans is not the same as Preston, as appears to be implied on p. 115, and that beagles do not, in the ordinary course of business, hunt foxes (p. 103). But the general quality of the writing is high, both in historical and in literary ability; and we may honestly hope to see more work from Mr. Dickinson which may fulfil the promise of this able and attractive little volume.

Election by Lot at Athens (Prince Consort Dissertation, 1890). By J. W. Headlam, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. 'Cambridge Historical Essays,' No. IV. (Cambridge: University Press, 1891.)

THE University Prize Essay is the nearest approach which we have in England to the Vortrag and the Program which pour forth in such an unceasing stream from the other side of the German Ocean, and in which so much useful research is embodied. The comparison is not exact, however, since in the German productions little is aimed at beyond the collection of facts or the discussion of arguments, while in the English essay the graces of literary style are not neglected, and, as a rule, the object is rather to arrange and re-state effectively facts that are already common property than to add anything substantial to the existing stock of knowledge. Mr. Headlam's essay, which occupies some 190 pages of ordinary octavo, is somewhat different from the common run of such productions. it conforms sufficiently to the English tradition so far as style is concerned, it also has something in common with its German kindred. Mr. Headlam has a subject which has never been treated from quite the same point of view before, and he has been able to produce a monograph which has some substantial and original value. facts, indeed, on which he relies are not new. It has always been known that the lot was largely in use as the means of election to office in the Athenian state, but no one seems to have taken the trouble to examine the meaning of this institution in all its bearings, and to trace its effects upon the history of Athens.

That the lot was a democratic institution has always been recognized, in spite of an ingenious paradox of the somewhat too imaginative Müller Strübing; but Mr. Headlam's object is to show that it was not merely the outcome of an irrational craze for equality, but was actually the indispensable condition of the maintenance of a truly democratic form of government. And the proof is clear when the facts are examined. The weakness of all democracies lies in the fact that the practical administration of the state is almost sure to

to

a

re

th

th

ne

ar

th

H

tio

to

wh

me

pas

the

un

sus

sta

the

oth

of

pas

und

imp

imp

tion

dev

exa

unq

THI

prep

slip out of the control of the mass of the people into the hands of a select council or senate, or it may be a single autocrat, possessing semi-professional skill and experience. Such a body existed once at Athens in the Council of Areopagus, and it had actually controlled the whole administration of the state; and it was the object of the framers of the democracy to prevent the continuance of that state of things. This was effected by the removal of all political business from the Areopagus, and the application of the principle of the lot to the Council of Five Hundred, which was the administrative committee of the popular Assembly. A body elected by lot (and to which, as we now know, re-election was only possible once) could only represent the average intelligence of the ordinary Such a body could do the routine administrative work which properly belonged to it, while it had neither the ability nor the permanence necessary to bring about the concentration of power in its own hands. It remained simply a committee of the sovereign Assembly.

Next to the Council, the chief danger would be likely to arise from permanent officials. But the Athenians had no permanent officials. With hardly any exceptions, except the posts of military command, the magistracies were filled by elections by lot, and re-election was inadmissible. Such officials had neither the opportunity nor the ability to make themselves the centres of authority; they merely prepared work for the Assembly, and carried out its The initiative remained with the Assembly, thanks to

the institution of the lot.

The obvious objection is, where, then, does the actual devising and suggestion of policy find a place in the Athenian constitution? No state can live by routine alone; there must be some one whose duty it is to propose measures and initiate policy. The explanation is clear. The responsibility for choice rested with the Assembly; the initiative in proposal with the advisers of the Assembly, the professional orators or demagogues. It is one of the most extraordinary features of the Athenian democracy that the suggestion of its policy was in the hands of men who held no official position, and who had no security that their advice, accepted to-day, would be carried to its natural development to-morrow. That such a system must be disastrous reason seems to suggest and history to show; but it was the only system by which the essence of democracy, the direct control of policy by the popular Assembly, could be secured; and it is from this point of view alone that Mr. Headlam is concerned to examine it. No doubt the Assembly might submit itself to the guidance of one leader in particular, as, for the most part, it did in the case of Pericles; but, so far as it did so, it abandoned the ideal of the absolute democracy.

All this is brought out with great clearness and fully illustrated by Mr. Headlam, who shows how, from the great number of official posts and the absence of re-election to them, every Athenian citizen was practically certain to have experience of official life, and thereby to obtain an infinitely fuller insight into the mechanism of govern-

July

of a

ssing ce at

olled

the

state

busif the

ative

(and

once)

inary

work

y nor

on of

f the

arise

anent

litary

id re-

ppor-

ority;

ut its

ks to

vising

ition?

whose

plana-

mbly;

y, the

extra-

ion of

sition,

would

such a

ory to of de-

embly,

e that

sembly

lar, as,

s it did

strated

official

citizen

thereby government than is possible to the ordinary citizen of a modern state, however democratic its constitution. Every citizen was trained in politics, and was consequently competent, at all events to some degree, to judge how his fellow-citizens fulfilled their duties when in office, and to take an intelligent share in the discussions and votes in the great assembly. Such a condition of things was only possible in a community which was based upon slavery, where all who possessed the privileges of citizens were exempt from the necessity of constant toil, and had leisure to devote themselves to the discussion of politics and the performance of official duties. Such a condition cannot recur in modern days. We may not wish that it should; we may not consider that its effects were satisfactory; but we cannot deny that, after its kind, it was the most ideally complete democracy that the world has ever seen.

Mr. Headlam's essay was written before the appearance of the newly discovered treatise of Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, and he has only been able to refer in footnotes and an appendix to the light thrown by it on the present subject. On the whole Mr. Headlam is to be congratulated (more than many more distinguished speculators) on the very slight extent to which his theories are affected by the new matter so fortunately brought to light. His main thesis is undisturbed and receives new and interesting confirmations; only in one or two less important points do his views require modification. One passage of considerable value for his purpose he seems to have overlooked. He discusses at some length the question whether re-election was admissible to the offices to which appointment was made by lot, and in the appendix he draws attention to the passage in 'A θ . Π o λ . ch. 4, in which it is directly asserted that under the constitution of Draco re-election to the Council was inadmissible until every one had had his turn; but that passage is subject to some suspicion, and Mr. Headlam omits to mention that in ch. 62 it is stated that in the writer's own day, under the full-blown democracy, the military commands might be held any number of times, but no other office might be held more than once, except the membership of the Council, to which a single re-election was admissible. passage establishes Mr. Headlam's contention on a firm basis of unquestionable evidence.

The study of Athenian constitutional history has received a fresh impulse from the unexpected appearance of new material of such importance as that contained in the Aristotelian treatise just mentioned; and it is to be hoped that Mr. Headlam will be able to devote to the study of the many questions which now need reexamination, the ability of which his first volume affords distinct and

unquestionable evidence.

The Weighty Charge, and other Ordination Addresses. By the Rev. George J. Blore, D.D., Honorary Canon of Canterbury. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1890.)

This little volume can be warmly recommended to those who are preparing for ordination, and those who are beginning their work in VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

N N

the ministry. The fact that these Addresses were printed at the express wish of those to whom they were delivered is in itself a considerable recommendation of them; and their character, when read, bears out this recommendation. Canon Blore makes no claim to originality of idea, and, indeed, no such originality would be possible or even desirable; but he has a gift of expressing clearly and directly the thoughts which most require to be put before the minds of those who are entering upon Holy Orders. His suggestions are practical, simple, and earnest, and, while they are primarily addressed to those just about to begin the work of the ministry, they would often be serviceable to those who are already engaged in the work, and who may find help in testing their own methods by the principles laid down in this volume. The Ordination Addresses are five in number, and the one on which we should be inclined to lay most stress is that on 'Diligence in Study.' We wish to echo most heartily Canon Blore's words (p. 16): 'Let me impress upon you most earnestly that you dare not neglect study without paying the penalty by feebleness, monotony, unspirituality in preaching and teaching.' It is a warning much needed now, when increased zeal in parochial work leaves less time for study. It is a matter for great thankfulness that there is such an increase of zeal for parochial and social work; but it will be an evil day for the Church when it cannot count among its bishops men of real and recognized learning, and when its clergy forget the cultivation of the mind in the multitudinous activities with which they are now laden.

All Canon Blore's Addresses are good, though this is the one which has struck us as most opportune; and in addition to the Addresses the volume contains, as Appendices, two papers, or portions of papers, of which the first deals with 'The Recognition of Historical Criticism of the Bible,' and the second with 'The Apostolic Succession.' On the former question, especially, young clergymen need advice at the present time, and Canon Blore's advice appears sound and sensible. He freely recognizes the right of critical inquiry to busy itself even with the Word of God, and quotes some instances of the benefits which we have derived from such criticism

in past times.

'There is criticism that is irreverent, presumptuous, anxious for novelty, intolerant of all tradition, eager for the overthrow of established opinions, always ready to start from some hasty hypothesis, and then to force all facts into accordance with it, and either to distort or deny, or to ignore, the facts that make against it. So it is when a certain school of critics lays down as an axiom that no future event can be foretold, and then settles the dates of the Old Testament writings in accordance with this axiom. . . On the other hand, there is a criticism that is reverent, humble, patient, longing only for the truth, entering upon inquiry with an open mind, and earnest and sincere prayer for guidance' (p. 92).

Canon Blore holds, and rightly, as it seems to us, that the clergy should acquaint themselves with the drift of criticism, not catching up every novel theory as certain, but not treating as closed, questions which learned men are content to consider still open. They are not gen bu gen the poi arg wh ma poi ing

18

cal

Ly

No

DOG

sele

It i

eas

unl

avo

pile man each is it won to so que a co hou the is the sect Dea and through the control of the co

Workis strain Men com sele Will fam rath

Par

higl

l at the itself a er, when no claim ould be g clearly efore the ggestions arily adstry, they ed in the ls by the ed to lay cho most pon you lying the ning and ased zeal for great chial and it cannot

July

the one on to the s, or porgnition of Apostolic clergymen e appears of critical otes some a criticism

ning, and

itudinous

nxious for established and then to deny, or to n school of d, and then e with this s reverent, aquiry with o. 92).

the clergy atching up , questions ney are not called on to thrust critical discussions down the throats of congregations which do not desire, and would not understand, them; but they must not use arguments in support of the faith which genuine criticism shows to be unsound, or at least uncertain, lest there should be some in the congregation who may detect the weak point, and so be led to distrust the whole. In short, they need not argue every point that criticism argues; but they must not assert what criticism can expose as untrue. This is sound teaching, and may guide many a young clergyman in his decision on the difficult point how to treat the ideas of contemporary criticism when preaching to an ordinary mixed congregation, so as neither to mystify the unlearned nor disgust the educated—extremes which are not always avoided by the preachers of this or, presumably, of any other day.

Lyra Consolationis, from the Poets of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries. Selected and arranged by Claudia Frances Hernaman. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1890.)

No class of publication is more easy to criticize than selections of poetry. So much depends on the 'personal equation' of the selector, and no two persons would make exactly the same choice. It is easy for anyone to point out pieces that he would have omitted, and to name others that he would have included. But while an easy, it is also a somewhat futile class of criticism; for as the compiler's selection only represents his own taste and judgment in the matter, so the critic's comments only represent his own view, and each reader remains free to judge between compiler and critic. is more useful to indicate the lines on which the compiler has worked, and to leave each reader to judge whether the result is likely to suit his individual taste. Moreover, whether one agrees or not on questions of literary opinion, no one can wish otherwise than well to a collection of poetry designed to comfort Christian mourners in the hour of their bereavement, and to lead them to find consolation in the faith which they believe, and the Lord whom they worship. This is the purpose of the volume under notice. It is divided into four sections. The first, occupying more than half the volume, deals with Death in its various aspects; the others with Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Coming. The poems selected are avowedly devotional throughout, and are chosen on that ground rather than with any thought for literary merit. Not that literary merit is neglected. Parts of Lycidas and Adonais are given, and among other poets of high rank that are represented are Spenser, Vaughan, Cowper, Wordsworth, Longfellow, Mrs. Browning, Keble, and Newman. What is surprising, however, is that not a single selection is given from In Memoriam, a poem in which many a mourner must have found comfort and help. A large portion of the volume is occupied by selections from writers of less note, such as J. M. Neale, Isaac Williams, H. Bonar, F. W. Faber, and others whose names are less familiar than these. As a whole, the selection is distinctly devotional rather than literary, but it is so of set purpose, and it includes much

18

th

m

its

re

m

fo

kr

bu

va

th

do

un

int

pro

the

see

an

va

an

Go

int

Ca

and

pie 'in

pai

La

ind

wri

we

dar

fine poetry, along with helpful thoughts, and at the moments for which such a volume as this is intended, it is the thoughts rather than the poetry that are in the minds of those that read.

Hegel's Logic: a Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind. A Critical Exposition. By WILLIAM T. HARRIS, LL.D., U.S. Commissioner of Education. (Chicago, 1890.)

If the series of philosophical classics of which this volume forms a part is in the hands of authors so well acquainted with their subject as Dr. Harris, it must indeed be a valuable help to philosophical study in America. The name of Hegel is almost proverbial for bewilderment and obscurity, and his system is one of those things with which only the fewest and boldest are popularly supposed to cope. We must freely acknowledge that any person who reads Dr. Harris's account of Hegel's logic will find it difficult and exacting enough; but if he then compares it with the volumes dealing with the same area in Hegel's works he will be astonished to find that the Hegelian logic has been presented both clearly and succinctly. Dr. Harris is possessed with a great enthusiasm for his subject, and evidently regards the philosophy of Hegel as presenting the final type To his mind it not only contains in itself the best of philosophy. results of Aristotelian and scholastic speculation, and avoids the errors of Kant and Schelling, its immediate precursors, but it also presents in a rational form the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This is, of course, the point most in dispute of all in connexion with the Hegelian philosophy. There are, we all know, two schools of the followers of Hegel-those who think with Dr. Harris, and those who regard a form of Pantheism as the true result of Hegel's thought. We cannot pretend to hold a balance between them and decide which of them really expresses most truly the mind of Hegel; but we cannot deny that the defence of the Trinitarian doctrine which Hegelianism supplies seems to us to involve theology in associations which are likely to do it more harm than good. The whole matter turns on the validity of Hegel's account of self-consciousness in its truest form. This he believes to be represented by the Christian idea of God, the importance of which lies in the fact that it does not bind down the Divine Being within the monotonous unity of bare monotheism, but conceives God as Three in One. It will be remembered that certain Fathers-notably St. Athanasius and St. Augustine-have spent much effort in an endeavour to express this doctrine rationally in human language. Thus St. Athanasius, starting from the phraseology of St. Paul, speaks of the Son as the Eternal Image of the Father, and draws out various inferences from this idea. And St. Augustine much more elaborately finds an analogy to the Divine Trinity in the nature of man's soul with its three parts, memoria, intelligentia, and voluntas. Further, he regards the Son as the eternal object of the Divine love, and the Holy Spirit as the bond of love-no less eternal-which unites the two. One point as to which both Fathers are clear is that the Holy Trinity is complete without creation. Hegel conceives a process somewhat resembling this to be not only nts for rather

Mind.

forms a subject bial for e things osed to ads Dr. exacting ing with that the ly. and evinal type the best oids the t it also Trinity. ion with ls of the ose who thought. de which e cannot elianism hich are s on the est form. God, the lown the eism, but t certain ve spent onally in raseology e Father, ugustine ty in the ntia, and

ct of the

—no less

Fathers

creation.

not only

the true account of the Holy Trinity, but also the formal law of mental evolution. The personal subject negates itself and becomes its opposite, the object; but finding itself in that object, returns into itself. These stages of pure subjectivity—self-objectification and return into self—correspond with the Three Persons. Moreover the mind, as it moves from the lower stages of knowledge to the higher, follows the same law. Each category, under the form of which it has knowledge, passes over into another which is its opposite, which opposition is solved by a higher concept including both. Not only is this the law of the evolution of knowledge, it is also an objective law of existence; and hence the process of passing over into other, and return into self, explains to us the whole of finite being.

This is, of course, but a poor account of a most elaborate system, but we think it contains the essential features of it sufficiently for our purpose. It is manifest that everything depends (whether we regard it primarily as a rationalizing of the Trinitarian doctrine or a system of metaphysic) upon the fact that the process is regarded as equally valid for the mental and historical evolution, for thing as well as thought. For if it is not so valid it fails either to put Trinitarian doctrine in connexion with experience or to give an account of the universe. That consciousness is the source of all law—that we must interpret the world according to the laws of our own mind-we are prepared to admit. But that this should make it necessary to accept the Hegelian system of categories we entirely deny. This system seems to us to fail in two respects. It is not necessary, i.e. the deduction of one category from another does not seem logically inevitable, and further it does not seem to make good its claim to be objectively valid, i.e. we do not think that as yet the opposition between subject and object is or can be solved. If it be true that in the nature of God will and thought are identical, it is not yet true of man; and, even though we may look to find it true hereafter, it is not even intelligible as yet.

Contributions chiefly to the Early History of the late Cardinal Newman, with Comments. By his Brother, F. W. NEWMAN, Emeritus Professor of University College, London. (London: Kegan Paul and Co., 1891.)

By a curious coincidence the same year which gives to the world Cardinal Newman's Correspondence, much of which is between him and members of his own family, gives to it also this strange little piece of family biography. The writer tells us in the Introduction that 'in the cause of Protestantism he feels bound to write, however painful to himself, as simply as if his topic were an old Greek or Latin.' He has certainly not shrunk from the obligation; it might, indeed, have been 'an old Greek or Latin,' not 'a brother from whom in his rising manhood he received inestimable benefits,' of whom he writes; for he remorselessly exposes what he considers that brother's weaknesses, traverses his assertions, and represents him as a most dangerous character to Protestants. He is, in one sense, master of the situation; when he makes assertions about purely private and

d

n

ir

d

te

01

C

m

si

It

ec

al

A

SI

SI

family affairs of seventy or eighty years ago, an outsider, of course, cannot contradict him. All one can say is, that the Correspondence, which includes letters from the mother and two or three of the sisters, gives a very different impression of J. H. Newman from that which the brother gives; and that in the very few references in that Correspondence to Francis Newman there is not one single syllable of unkindness. The elder brother treats the younger in a very different way from that in which the younger treats the elder. In one important point, however, The Early History emphasizes most markedly an opinion which we have always held, and which is borne out indirectly by the Correspondence, viz. that John Henry Newman never had any early training in true Church principles. This is probably not the conclusion which his brother would desire us to draw from his unbrotherly little book, but we thank him for the help he has given us in drawing it nevertheless.

The Battle of Belief; a Review of the present Aspects of the Conflict. By Nevison Loraine, Vicar of Grove Park West, London. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

THE writer's 'aim is to provide a work that may be suited in style, and in size also, to the many who have neither leisure, nor possibly present inclination, to study large and recondite treatises '(Preface); and, difficult as the task must have been, he appears to us to have succeeded well in accomplishing his aim. As he more than once hints, he has himself been troubled with doubts, and can therefore write with sympathy as well as force. The earlier part of the volume is more interesting than the later, which largely consists of extracts from unwilling witnesses whom the writer has pressed into his service. Professors Huxley, Tyndall and F. Newman, Messrs. Herbert Spencer, Frederic Harrison and Darwin, George Eliot and Sir James Stephen -by the way, would it not be better to call him Sir Fitzjames Stephen, to distinguish him from his equally eminent father?—are all quoted, and, so far as we know, quite fairly quoted, in evidence of the value and beauty of religion in general, and of the Christian Religion in particular. Isolated extracts are always rather jerky reading; but by the time the reader has come to this part, he will, we hope, have become thoroughly interested in the subject, and will have acquired a sufficient confidence in his author. We heartily commend this able, judicious and earnest little work to all-alas! we fear, a numerous class-who have any doubts about the old faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

Our Lord's Miracles of Healing; considered in relation to some modern Objections and to Medical Science. By T. W. Belcher, D.D., D.M., &c., with Preface by R. C. Trench, [late] Archbishop of Dublin. Second edition. (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1891.)

This is an evidential work of a different type from the last, but equally valuable in its way. It is an ingenious and interesting defence of Our Lord's Miracles of Healing as miracles. The writer, who was a

course, idence, of the m that in that syllable a very er. In es most s borne ewman is pro-

July

Conflict. ondon.

nelp he

n style, ossibly reface): to have an once erefore volume extracts service. pencer, Stephen tephen, quoted, e value gion in but by ave becquired nd this fear, a nce for

modern a, D.D., ishop of Okeden,

equally ence of o was a distinguished physician before he received Holy Orders, brings his medical knowledge to bear upon the Gospel accounts, and shows that in each of the twenty-one cases of healing it is quite impossible to explain the phenomena by natural, or rather human, causes. He also makes a strong, and quite a fair point, in bringing out the differences between the way in which St. Luke and the other three Evangelists tell their tales; the former frequently using technical terms, and viewing the cases generally from the professional, the others from the lay, standpoint. In this way, his work is a valuable contribution to that class of apologetic literature of which Dr. Paley and Professor Blunt gave us such excellent specimens. The reader must not be frightened away from this volume -as we frankly own that on reading the title we were inclined to be-by the apprehension that it will be too professional to be appreciated by the lay mind. It is quite within the compass of any man of ordinary intelligence and education; and it is for such, not for the uneducated, that Dr. Belcher avowedly writes; it is only here and there that he ever uses a term which cannot be readily understood; and his general purport is always perfectly plain and simple. The volume comes recommended by one who was, in his day, an authority on the Miracles; and we heartily endorse the Archbishop's remark that 'the writer must inspire confidence in all' who read him.

The Light of the World, or the Great Consummation. By Sir Edwin Arnold. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

A NEW poem by the writer of *The Light of Asia* will naturally be turned to with eager interest; and we may say at once that, as a poem, *The Light of the World* is worthy of its authorship. Its smooth and musical rhythm, its exquisite taste, its fervent piety, the singular beauty of its general conceptions, are undeniable. If its opening lines are to be taken literally, the writer has chosen his subject because he has sought in vain satisfaction elsewhere, and has turned back with simple faith to 'the old, old story,' trusting that there he shall find rest and comfort:—

Suffer, if one of modern mood steals back—
Weary and way-worn, from the Desert-road
Of barren thought; from Hope's Dead Sea which glow'd
With Love's fair mirage; from the Poet's haunt,
The Scholar's lamp, the Statesman's scheme, the vaunt,
The failure, of all fond Philosophies—
Back unto Thee, back to thy olive-trees,
Thy people, and thy story, and thy Son,
Mary of Nazareth! so long agone
Bearing us Him Who made our Christendom,
And came to save the Earth, from Heav'n, His home' (p. 2).

We are quite sure that no one, poet or otherwise, ever did this in sincerity and truth without finding what he sought. Only he must take the story as he finds it, and not pick and choose this part and reject that, or import into it theories of his own. And here we must venture to join issue with Sir Edwin Arnold. He is a good poet,

but a bad theologian. He has of course a right to claim a poet's licence, and we find no fault with him for having, by a purely gratuitous assumption, changed St. Mary Magdalene into the wealthy Lady Miriam of Magdala, whose house is the only one in the little town fit to receive—

'A Roman Consular
Of the high Samnite race of Telesine,
Judæa's Governor, thro' ten strong years,
And, maybe, yet to rule all Syria,
If Cæsar purges'—

In other words, Pontius Pilate and his patrician wife, Procula. The conception of the meeting between the Procurator and the penitent, and the whole carrying out of the scene, are wonderfully fine, and we can well afford to forgive any historical inaccuracies in them. Nor do we at all complain that the poet boldly assumes, against all probabilities, the identity of the Magdalene with Mary of Bethany, nor of Lazarus, her brother, with the young man who had great possessions, and with the other young man, of S. Mark (xiv. 51-2). What Milan will say to the turning of the three Magi into Buddhists, we do not know; but we are quite content to let that also pass. Nor, again, would we quarrel with Sir Edwin Arnold because his Gospel history is rather shaky-shakier, we hope, now than it was thirty or forty years ago, when as an Oxford man he went into the Schools. For what would an Oxford examiner say if an examinee informed him that it was Peter to whom Our Lord said, 'Hast thou been so long with Me, and yet hast thou not known Me?' or if he were told as a certain Biblical fact that Jesus walked in the streets of Tyre? These, however (as Sir Edwin is not now an examinee in the Divinity Schools), are quite minor matters which involve no question of faith But when Sir Edwin asserts that the infant Saviour or practice. could not really have been God, otherwise He would never have permitted the Massacre of the Innocents (p. 36); when he bursts into a furious tirade against the Old Dispensation as he does more than once (see pp. 217, 236, &c.), then we are compelled to say that he cannot both eat his cake and have his cake. He cannot logically (though we are quite sure that he does sincerely) admire the perfect character of Our Blessed Lord, which he describes so beautifully (see p. 230 and passim), and yet deny His claim to a real Divinity; for over and over again Our Lord makes and allows such a claim: if He knew that it was false, He was a gross impostor; if He did not know it, He was a weak enthusiast. He cannot, again, logically extol the goodness and wisdom of Christ, and yet abhor as barbarous and immoral the Old Dispensation which Christ over and over again stamps with His approval. We have neither space nor desire to grapple with these matters in this connexion; for it is as a poet, not as an amateur theologian, that we would regard Sir Edwin Arnold. It is all the more provoking that he thinks it necessary to air his heretical notions, because they spoil the poetry as poetry. Whether right or wrong, such sentiments as those we have referred to must be admitted to open the door to very wide questions, the discussion re an N

na

viv

wh

and

pro

of

or

he

u

whiper Incompression and converse white in History work truth Pussion and the converse with the conver

(p. ther tion ratio of content content

in t

IT i

Life

of which is quite out of place in a poem or in the review of a poem. These ebullitions of amateur theology might all be excised, not only without injury, but with distinct advantage, to the poem. Could he not find some judicious Bowdler to exercise the pruning knife upon them before the next edition comes out? Then we could recommend his work, as we cannot conscientiously do now, without any reservation whatever.

Notes and Questions on the Catholic Faith and Religion. The Notes and Answers compiled chiefly from the Works and in the Words of Dr. Pusey. With a Preface by the Rev. T. T. CARTER. (London: Walter Smith and Innes, 1891.)

Of the three great leaders of the Oxford Movement, the one whose name was most identified with it is the least known. An outsider can realize the personality of Mr. Keble and Dr. Newman much more vividly than that of Dr. Pusey. When the long-promised 'Life,' which we only trust will not defeat its own end by being too minute and exhaustive, shall at length appear, it will probably be otherwise; but meanwhile we welcome any book which brings Dr. Pusey more prominently before the notice of the public, and especially one which comes stamped with the approval of so distinguished a personal friend and disciple of the great leader as Canon Carter. Indeed the most interesting, if not the most valuable part of the present volume is the short Preface which Canon Carter writes with an authority which few, if any now living, possess.

'As a younger,' he writes, 'with him as an elder, boy at Eton; as a commoner at Christ Church, Oxford, with him as Professor living in the well-known house in the corner of "Tom Quad;" as a guide and counsellor during the rest of his life, till the sad and ever memorable day on which I knelt at the foot of his bed on which he lay taking his last sleep, in his simple cottage home at Ascot, with the few who then watched till his spirit had passed away, and his eyes were closed for ever on this world—he has ever been to me as a Pole Star in the regions of Divine truth' (p. viii).

Pusey, like Keble, but unlike Newman, had been 'bred and nurtured in the highest Church of England piety and teaching of the time' (p. ix); and we find evident traces of this training in his writings; there is an air of quiet, calm conviction about them, a clear conception of the revival as being merely a development, or rather a restoration of the old, not a new departure. The present volume is a sort of elongated catechism, the notes and answers being compiled chiefly from the works and in the words of Dr. Pusey. It deals with an enormous number of subjects, no less than 156, in the short space of 342 pages. It is, therefore, a book not so much for continuous reading, as for continual reference, and, as such, we cordially commend it to our readers.

Life and Letters of Robert Browning. By Mrs. SUTHERLAND ORR. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1891.)

It is no reflection on Mrs. Sutherland Orr to say that this is only a temporary biography of its great subject. Whether a fuller and

XU

oet's urely althy little

July

ocula.

I the
rfully
ses in
umes,
ary of
o had
(1-2).
Ihists,
Nor,
Gospel
arty or
hools.

een so re told Tyre? ivinity f faith aviour re perinto a re than that he gically

ormed

perfect ly (see ty; for tim: if did not ogically barous or again

esire to bet, not Arnold. air his hether o must

cussion

more complete one will ever be presented or demanded, it is impossible to say; but with the conditions under which Mrs. Orr was obliged to work, she could not have produced a biography which should take its place either as a final utterance on Robert Browning, or as a work of finished literary art in itself. Browning himself destroyed a great amount of evidence bearing on his earlier life, and his relations have objected to the publication of many of his letters. In both cases we hold the judgment to be wise and right; but it inevitably prevents the biographer from producing either a piquant volume of contemporary gossip or a complete study of the character Mrs. Orr's volume is, in fact, the product of the public of the man. demand for authentic and authoritative details concerning the life of the great poet whom we have lost; and this demand she has satisfied so far as it is possible to do so, without ministering to an undesirable curiosity, or hurting the feelings of persons still alive. The volume contains a complete account of what may be called the externalities of Browning's life; it also contains a sprinkling of illustrative anecdotes, some (but not many) of the poet's letters, and some (which are not the least interesting part of the volume) of his wife's, and here and there brief criticisms on or explanations of his poems. His personal characteristics are also described, and though there is not much that is new in Mrs. Orr's information on this subject, yet some common conceptions (e.g. as to Browning's invariable health and buoyant spirits) are modified, no doubt with perfect truth. If, however, we are to say what appears to be the defect of the volume, it is that it fails to convey any clear idea to the reader of the character and comparative worth of Browning's various works. The biography is a supplement to a knowledge of the poems, rather than an introduction to them. A biographer, though he need not be blindly enthusiastic about his hero, should at least present his merits in an attractive way to his readers, and incite them to a further acquaintance with his actual works; but we doubt whether anyone, not already acquainted with Browning, would be especially stimulated to the study of him by Mrs. Orr's volume. In particular, the best period of his work, that in which Dramatic Lyrics, Men and Women, Dramatis Persona, and the best of the plays were produced, is passed over very lightly and without emphasis.

Mrs. Orr has, however, written elsewhere about the poetry of Robert Browning, and for the rest she has done well the work which lay with her to do, and her volume must be, for some time at least, the standard authority for the facts of the poet's life. We do not profess to be anxious for those fuller revelations which are hinted at as possible. If there are letters of Robert Browning which can be published without offence to anyone, and which illustrate fairly the mind of the man, and have a literary value of their own, it goes without saying that every lover of his work would be glad to see them. But we much doubt their existence. Browning's gift of utterance was in verse, not in prose, as he well knew himself. His letters in this volume confirm this impression. They are full of a warm and often noble spirit, but they are disjointed in form and of little literary

a

he

in

at

E

wit

'gı

arr

COI

It i

this

the

bel

whi

influ

sign

nati

more

Brow

1891

s imrr was which wning, imself e, and etters. but it iquant aracter public life of atisfied sirable volume nalities e anec-(which nd here s. His e is not

et some

lth and

If, how-

me, it is

haracter

ography

an intro-

blindly

its in an

ecquaint-

one, not imulated the best Women, duced, is poetry of ork which e at least, Ve do not hinted at ch can be fairly the n, it goes see them. utterance

letters in

warm and

tle literary

value, and there is no reason to believe that they are otherwise than representative specimens. Therefore we do not press for further revelations of the poet's private life. Browning's life would, indeed, bear inspection better than that of many men of letters, even of the greatest; but it is an irrelevant curiosity that prompts such inspection. He himself disliked it, protested against it, took measures (and apparently effective measures) to baffle it; and it is no true respect for him that tries to force its way behind the veil. His work, his character, are in his poems. There, without in the least trying to interpret all his dramatic utterances as expressions of his personal views, the reader can obtain a fuller and, it may even be said, a higher knowledge of his gifts and character than he will derive from his biography. Such outline of the external circumstances of the composition of the chief poems as is necessary for the comprehension of them can be obtained from Mrs. Orr's volume; and, apart from this, the best guide to a knowledge of Browning is a careful

and repeated study of his work.

Of the character of that work, with its multitudinous activity, its dramatic creativeness, its emotional force, its intellectual power, there is no room to speak here. Without seeking unduly to extract 'lessons' and 'philosophy' from his writings, it is yet true that many have found extreme delight in studying his wonderful gallery of portraits of men and women, many have been strengthened and encouraged in the various joys and sorrows of life by his universal sympathy with moods of every kind. Many who recognize that there are greater poets than Browning in the history of English literature. yet find none more to their mind, none more dear to them as a companion. And in the pages of a Church magazine it may be said his influence was always on the side of Christianity. Mrs. Orr calls him heterodox; and unquestionably he did not attach himself to any one in particular of the sections into which Christendom is divided, nor attend any particular form of worship; but the author of Christmas Eve, of A Death in the Desert, of Ferishtah's Fancies, was assuredly a true Christian; nor do we see that La Saisiaz is inconsistent with this, as Mrs. Orr seems to hold. Mrs. Orr herself calls him a 'great free-lance, who fought like the gods of old with the regular army' (p. 375), and she mentions also that 'no intercourse was more congenial to him than that of the higher class of English clergymen.' It is absurd to wrangle over the exact form of belief of a man like this. That is his affair, not ours; and it is sufficient to know that in the greatest essentials he was at one with the religion which we believe, and that his influence was invariably on the side of that which is upright, manly, earnest, and hopeful. No more healthy influence has appeared in English literature, and it will be a good sign of the soundness of the heart, as well as the intellect, of the nation, if the study of Browning shall increase and flourish more and more as time passes on.

In conclusion it is not unfitting to quote some lines written by Browning for the gravestone of a devoted American admirer, Mr.

Levi Thaxter. They are, unless we are mistaken, the only absolutely new verses contained in Mrs. Orr's volume:—

'Thou, whom these eyes saw never—say friends true Who say my soul, helped onward by my song, Though all unwittingly, has helped thee too? I gave but of the little that I knew:
How were the gift requited, while along
Life's path I pace, couldst thou make weakness strong,
Help me with knowledge—for Life's old, Death's new!

 A Dead Man's Diary, written after his Decease. With a Preface by G. T. Bettany, M.A. Third edition. (London, New York, and Melbourne: Ward, Lock, and Co., 1890.)

2. Beata Spes: some Reasons for the Blessed Hope of Everlasting Life. By John Watkins Pitchford, M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Southwark. (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1890.)

1. WE hope that among the thousands who in London, New York, and Melbourne have been buying the Dead Man's Diary there may be some to whom it will do good. But we cannot say that it has done much good to us; for, though there is undeniable talent in some of these chapters, dashed off at railway speed for a magazine, we think that even fiction, if it must needs concern itself with the question of future retribution, should teach a consistent idea. from Hell, the Divine Comedy and Faust, from all which various sources the Dead Man liberally borrows, were serious and consistent in their conceptions. But here we have a lost soul able to communicate to us all the secrets of the blessed life. Here we have a writer who has discovered that heaven and hell are states, not places, representing a too social offender as roaming round in the future life, seeking in vain for a companion. In fact, whenever some good idea strikes the author's mind, in poetry or painting or any department of life, good or bad, present or future, he easily manages to include it between these sensational covers marked with a ghostly pen. And it would appear that all his experiences, though including no less a transition than that from hell to heaven, were compressed into the two days after his death, and before, in some unexplained fashion, he came to life again. Therefore, although the work contains some passages which display no mean comprehension of the secret of Christianity, we fear that the lightness with which the whole subject is treated will not tend to promote a sense that in dealing with Christian doctrine and Christian morality we are dealing with genuine

2. The work of Mr. Pitchford is extremely well intended, and contains a large collection of excellent extracts; but his style is not lucid. For instance—

'If we assume that man's nature is uncompounded, we need not wonder that apprehensions so grave should be excited by such phenomena; but if we recognize the dual element in man—that is, the material and the spiritual—the difficulty does not seem so great. That the mental, moral, and physical powers are gradually developed is quite obvious.

0

bi

th

of

the

bo

mo

Th

see

see

July

But it deserves careful enquiry whether the periods of their maturity and the ratio of their development be not wholly different (p. 49).

We should have thought that a proof (if it could be given) that man's nature was uncompounded would also prove it indestructible; and so thought Butler.

With a Song in the Heart, and other Sermons, preached in St. Ignatius's Church, New York. By the Rev. Arthur Ritchie. 1890. (New York: The Guild of St. Ignatius, 1891.)

Mr. RITCHIE informs us that, were there no celebration of the Holy Eucharist in any church of his own communion within his reach, he would feel bound to attend Mass in a Roman church.

'It may be urged,' he says, 'against such a practice that it is always inconsistent and disloyal to one's own mother Church to attend Roman services, because the Church of Rome continually and wilfully insults and disparages the Anglican. While I agree in this most thoroughly in principle, and while I would no more attend a Roman service than I would visit persons who declared my mother to be no true wife, there is an exception, and it is found just in this matter of hearing Mass' (p. 95).

Mr. Ritchie's notion of principle is peculiar. But his little volume of sermons gives us many curious notes on the Catholic revival in the American Church, some of them very encouraging, some of them, like the above, perhaps not wholly impervious to criticism.

Selections from the Writings of Isaac Williams, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. (London: Longmans, 1890.)

There is no need that we should pass any eulogy on the writings of Isaac Williams. Their value is recognized, and they have been honoured as devotional helps by two generations of Church people. Upon the selection we need merely say that it is carefully made, and well fitted to be a companion in the hours of meditation. Disputed questions and doctrinal discussions are untouched in the work, but there is a simple and devout reality in the treatment of Bible passages which harmonizes well with the tone of the holy book itself. We select the following comment on one of the prominent remembrances of Eastertide:—

'How many are the thoughts that throng on the mind at the sight of the earnest Mary Magdalene, with her two companions, hastening in the twilight through the guilty city, and now at length approaching the place of sorrows! For we know the good things which awaited them, which they knew not; and perhaps even thus do the spirits that are gone look on the sorrows of saints, while they behold them approaching that boundary where their sorrows shall for ever cease. In the meanwhile, in the midst of such desolation, there is a voice in the heart of the devout mourner which says, "O God, Thou art my God; early will I seek Thee!" and that same voice from the Spirit of God whispers that there is no seeking Him in vain: "I love them that love Me, and those that seek Me early shall find Me." So mysterious is the light that springeth up in such darkness. For the heart within unconsciously sustains, knowing that, as the psalmist says, "He hath never failed them that seek Him."

refac**e** York,

utely

lasting Jude's,

York,

re may s done some ne, we e ques-Letters various nsistent ommua writer , repreire life, od idea ment of include tly pen. ding no sed into fashion, ns some ecret of

genuine ded, and le is not

subject

ing with

need not ch phenoe material ne mental, e obvious. St. Paul: his Life and Times. By James Iverach, M.A., Professor of Apologetics, &c., Free Church College, Aberdeen. (London: James Nisbet and Co.)

This book is one of a series entitled 'Men of the Bible,' and the writer has executed his task with considerable ability and research. He has consulted not only the popular English works on the subject, but the chief German speculators. His style is manly and pure, and he is never dull. It is perhaps unreasonable to complain that a Professor at the Free Church College, Aberdeen, does not exactly harmonize with the principles advocated by the Church Quarterly Review; but this is certainly the case. It rather jars upon us, for instance, to hear about Paul and Peter and Luke, as if we were hearing about the man in the street. Now and then, indeed, and apparently for no particular reason, the 'Saint' is prefixed to the name of Paul, but generally he is plain Paul, and the others are always plain Peter, Luke, &c. Then again, as a matter of taste, the book appears to us to be too much modernized. It is surely no improvement to translate the quaint and beautiful simplicity of the Scripture narrative into the language and ideas of the latter part of the nineteenth century. Is not this a queer way of describing the state of mind in which Judas (of Damascus) would receive St. Paul?- 'To him the arrival of his expected guest in his helpless state must have been a painful surprise. No doubt his hospitality would expand to meet the claim made upon it,' and so forth (p. 19). Does it add anything to our knowledge that 'the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord,' to be told that 'their movement obtained striking success, and met with emphatic approval' (p. 37)? Barnabas 'was one who had pleasant relations with all parties '(p. 64); James 'proceeds to give his own view-a view not quite so liberal as that of Peter, but one more likely to be agreeable to all present' (p. 65)—a description much more suitable, as it seems to us, to county councillors than to Apostles at the first Council of Jerusalem. The touching scene between St. Paul and the brethren at Tyre 'reminds one of the similar conflict between Luther and his friends as to the danger he should encounter if he appeared before the Emperor' (p. 149). It may remind Professor Iverach, but it does not remind us. The 'brethren' at Mnason's house are 'people, for the most part, of Paul's way of thinking' (p. 153). And then we hear, of course, of the 'Pauline theology' and 'Paulinism' (p. 203)—what were these but 'the faith once for all delivered unto the saints'?

It must not be gathered from all this that the author is at all inclined to Rationalism. If he sometimes raises, rather unnecessarily, giants (mostly of German extraction) in order immediately afterwards to knock them on the head, yet he always does knock them on the head. Nor does he, we believe, ever write with conscious irreverence. The faults we have noticed, if they are faults, simply arise from the sort of training which would naturally result from the worship in the religious community to which he belongs.

h

ir

I

ai

W

"t

pi

ex

fie

ar

of

Re

and

his

July

essor

don:

l the

arch.

bject,

hat a

xactly

rterly

is, for

were

l, and

to the

rs are

e, the

o im-

of the

of the

and to d any-

n; and

ld that

elations

iew-a

y to be

uitable,

he first

aul and

etween

er if he

rofessor

[nason's

inking'

eology

once for

is at all

cessarily,

terwards

n on the

verence.

from the

ip in the

Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West. By B. F. Westcott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

The present Bishop of Durham resembles his illustrious predecessor in many respects, but he differs from him in one—Dr. Lightfoot is always easy reading; Dr. Westcott is sometimes rather hard. But if the nut is a tough one to crack, the kernel is well worth the exertion necessary to reach it. The first part of the present volume deals with a subject which no one is more competent to handle than Dr. Westcott. Like another great prelate and scholar, the late Bishop of Lincoln, he thoroughly appreciates 'the religious use of classical subjects.' But while Bishop Wordsworth in his paper bearing that title, confined himself to one Roman poet (who, oddly enough, is not mentioned in the present volume, though the **Eneid** of Horace's contemporary is described as 'the Roman Gospel'), Bishop Westcott devotes himself to the still greater writers of Greece. And in this connexion, Plato, of course, takes the first place.

'The myths of Plato,' writes the Bishop, with no less truth than eloquence, 'in bold and vigorous outlines, offer a philosophy of nature, a philosophy of history, and a philosophy of life, deformed, it may be, by crude speculations in physics, and cramped by an imperfect knowledge and a necessarily narrow sphere of observation, but yet always inspired by the spirit of a divine life, centring in the devout recognition of an all-wise and all-present Providence, and in the inexorable assertion of human responsibility. In form, in subject, in the splendour of their imagery, and in the range of their application, they form, if we may so speak, an Hellenic Apocalypse' (pp. 46-7).

Perhaps 'The Allegory of the Cave' would hardly come under Dr. Westcott's idea of a myth; otherwise he could not have found any better illustration of what he desires to prove. The next essay is entitled 'The Dramatist as a Prophet: Æschylus,' and here Dr. Westcott is at his very best. He does not exaggerate when he says 'the Greek Theatre was indeed a national temple, and, more than this, the tragic poets were the national preachers' (p. 52); and, as a preacher, Æschylus unquestionably stands first. Sophocles may excel him in finished composition, but cannot approach him in vigour and earnestness. Most true is it that 'however wide the field which Æschylus covers, he sees all equally in the light of a Divine presence. Primitive myths, ancient traditions, historic events, are alike regarded by him from a spiritual point of sight. His view of life and society is in every case theocratic; and it is only by keeping this steadily in view that we can gain the central idea of his separate plays' (p. 58).

It has always seemed to us a sad drop when we have turned from Æschylus to Euripides; but in his next essay, 'Euripides as a Religious Teacher,' Dr. Westcott certainly sets before us the latest and least inspired of the three great dramatists in a light which will help us to read him with fresh interest. He cannot be compared, as a poet, with Sophocles, and still less with Æschylus, but from an

historical point of view he is more interesting than either.

T

T

pr

Ìn

al

me

wi

ear

tai

it i

CO

M

MI

the

Th

of

not

a v

tho

the

in

pro

ma

abo

God

for o

thar

'Euripides suffered, and thought, and wrote, at the meeting-point of conflicting currents of opinion and hope. He reflects and, to a certain extent, interprets the effects which followed from the dissolution of the old life and old faith under the calamities of the Peloponnesian war and the influence of foreign culture. He treated the drama as Socrates treated philosophy; he brought it to the common concerns of daily experience, to the trials and the passions of simple men and women. So it is that he is the most modern of the ancient tragedians, because he is the most human' (p. 130).

the most human' (p. 139).

'We can then study in Euripides a distinct stage in the preparation of the world for Christianity. He paints life as he found it when Greek art and Greek thought had put forth their full power. He scatters the dream which some have indulged in of the unclouded brightness of the Athenian prospect of life; and his popularity shows that he represented truly the feelings of those with whom he lived, and of those who came after him. His recognition of the mystery of being from the point of sight of the poet and not the philosopher; his affirmation of the establishment of the sovereignty of righteousness under the conditions of earth; his feeling after a final unity in the harmonious consummation of things in the supreme existence; his vindication of the claims of the fulness of man's nature, are so many testimonies of the soul to the character of the revelation which can perfectly meet its needs. Let anyone carefully ponder them, and consider whether they do not all find fulfilment in the one fact which is the message of the Gospel' (p. 140).

With Euripides the strictly classical part of Dr. Westcott's volume ends; and before we pass on let us heartily commend its serious study to those who are sceptical as to the advantage of retaining the Greek and Latin classics in their place of honour as instruments of education. The idea which forms the groundwork of these thoughtful essays may certainly be extended to other writers besides those therein named; and where else, we would ask, can one find thoughts so elevating, and therefore so conducive to the appreciation of the noblest of all themes, the Christian religion, as in the masterpieces of Greece and Rome, which never have been and never will be equalled? It may be more practically useful—in the narrowest sense of the term 'practical'-for some to learn how buttons are made or how gases are generated; but can there be any question as to which is the best suited for the purposes of real education? The next essay is on 'Dionysius the Areopagite,' or rather the pseudo-Dionysius, for no one now believes that this unknown author was really the convert of St. Paul. This essay, we are bound to say, is a tough one; and we doubt whether the mastering of the so-called Areopagite's views is worth the intellectual effort necessary for so doing. Very different is it with the next, on 'Origen and the beginning of Christian philosophy.' It is a most luminous and masterly elucidation of the Alexandrian school in general, and of Origen in particular; and if it appear to some to be rather hard reading, the game, in this case, is worth the candle. The titles of the other essays tell their own tales; the last one, 'Benjamin Whichcote,' makes us wish that Bishop Westcott would take up the study of that most interesting body of men, the Cambridge Platonists, of whom Whichcote was one, but by no means the most striking, representative. Principal

oint of

certain

of the

ar and

crates

ily ex-

n. So e he is

aration

Greek

ers the

of the

came

oint of

ablish-

earth;

things

ness of

r of the

t in the

volume

serious

ing the

ought-

oughts

of the

rpieces

will be

st sense nade or

which

ne next

onysius,

ally the

a tough

Areo-

doing.

ning of

elucida-

ticular;

game, in

us wish

interestcote was rincipal Tulloch has, indeed, written an admirable account of them from his own point of view; but that, of course, is not the point of view of an English Churchman; neither is that of Bishop Burnet, bishop though he was, who has given a most meagre account of them in the *History of His Own Time*. Surely it would be a subject after Bishop Westcott's own heart!

Parson and Peasant: some Chapters of their Natural History. By J. B. Burne, Rector of Waring. (London: Methuen and Co., 1891).

This book is really too delightful—we can use no milder expression. To attempt to show what it is by an extract is like presenting a brick to show what a building is like. With a sustained interest from first to last the parson records his intercourse with the peasant from precisely the opposite stand-point to that of the goody-goody books. Instead of being the preternatural incarnation of wisdom, he is always making mistakes, which he mercilessly recounts with the shrewdest sense and in the most amusing style. But he is by no means a mere clerical mountebank. On the contrary, he betrays, without any ostentation, that he is a good Churchman and an earnest and energetic parish priest. No clergyman can read this volume without deriving many useful hints as well as great entertainment from it; but, while we would recommend all such to read it for their own edification, we could not go a step further and recommend them to procure it for the parochial lending library.

Mary in the Epistles; or, the Implicit Teaching of the Apostles concerning the Blessed Virgin. By the Rev. Thomas Livius, C.SS.R. (London: Burns and Oates, 1891.)

MR. LEWIS CARROLL, in one of his charming little brochures, has the following chapter or section:—

'§ 5. On the other Architectural Merits of the new Belfry, Ch. Ch.
'The belfry has no other architectural merits.'

The idea was not quite original; there is a still shorter chapter of three words—'Mores non habent'—in Olaus Magnus, if we are not mistaken. But the contents, not only of a single chapter, but of a whole book, with the title of Mary in the Epistles, might be thought by some to be capable of being as briefly expressed, for there is but one passage, so far as we know, in all the Epistles in which the Blessed Virgin is directly referred to. The ingenious process by which the present volume is swelled out to 293 pages may be illustrated by the following extracts:—

'II Cor. iv. 15.—" For all things are for your sakes: That the grace abounding through Mary may abound in thanksgiving unto the glory of God."

'The fulness of grace, then, which Mary found and abounded in, is for our sakes too. On this account, therefore, it is for us to abound in thanksgiving, and so give glory to God" (p. 159).

thanksgiving, and so give glory to God " (p. 159).

'Eph. vi. 1.—" Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is just."

'In the Lord—that is, conformably to the precept and also to the VOL, XXXII.—NO. LXIV.

example of Jesus Christ, Who obeyed His parents. This is just; Mary then received as her due, as a matter of justice, the obedience and honour of her Son' (p. 194).

Mr. Livius complains in a foot-note (p. 15): 'It is wonderful how any text will serve the purpose of those who are determined to "have a hit" at the Catholics.' Possibly so, but is it less wonderful how any text will serve the purpose of some others besides those 'who are determined to have a hit at the Catholics'?

Notes on the Seven Penitential Psalms. By the Rev. A. G. MORTIMER, Rector of St. Mary's, Castleton, N.Y. (London: Masters and Co., 1889.)

This is a devotional commentary largely made up of quotations from the Fathers. It is a book to be read in a devotional spirit, not criticized, and we may therefore content ourselves with recommending it to our readers.

The Children's Year: Verses for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By C. H. WOODRUFF. (London: Longmans and Co., 1891.)

THIS book is avowedly on the plan of The Christian Year, but it does not challenge any invidious comparison with Keble's immortal work, for it is intended for a different class, viz., 'for children, and young persons at the age of, and during the years immediately following, confirmation.' We agree with the writer that 'while collections of devotional poetry for young children are sufficiently numerous, the class to whom the present volume is addressed has been less amply provided for.' Whether that class-especially boys-will ever be induced to read any devotional poetry, appears to us doubtful. From thirteen to seventeen is an age which does not love poetry; little children like rhyme, and grown up people like, or profess to like, poetry; but the average schoolboy is not a poetry-loving However, we heartily wish the writer success in his venture. His verses are of unequal merit, but they are all written with great spirit, clearness, and devoutness, while some of them rise to the level of true poetry.

A Manual for Catechising, with Stories and Illustrations. By the Rev. W. F. Shaw, Vicar of Eastry. (London: Griffiths, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1890.)

This is a plain, practical, unpretentious volume, which parochial clergy will find very useful in preparing for that too much neglected part of their duty—public catechising. It breaks up the Church catechism into fifty-nine catechisings—rather too minute a division for practical purposes, we should have thought. The stories and illustrations are for the most part good, though a few of them have scarcely sufficient point. It steers the catechist safely through the Scylla and Charybdis into one of which there is great danger of his falling, viz., too great abstruseness on the one hand, or too great childishness on the other. The teaching is plain, definite English Church teaching, to which no one who believes in the Book of Common Prayer can possibly object.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXII.

APO

fary nour erful ined less sides

MER, and itions

spirit,

ecom-

ighout

s and

but it

mortal

n, and

ollow-

ections

erous,

n less

ill ever

ubtful.

oetry;

fess to

-loving

in his

written

em rise

By the

Farran,

arochial

eglected

Church

ision for

nd illus-

m have

ugh the

r of his

oo great

English

of Com-

A POSTOLICAL succession, the loss of, in Denmark, 149 sqq.; beginning of the breach with ancient order: Christian II. (1513) and the claims of the Rigsraad, 151; the king's 'loans' from the churches and clergy, 153; Bishop Jens Andersen, 154; the 'Stockholm Bath of Blood,' 155; the king's desire for Church reform, 157; Paul 'Turncoat' (Eliesen), ib.; Luther's position towards Denmark, 158; Christian's autocratic legislation regarding the Church, 160; insurrection, 161; Christian replaced on the throne by Frederick I., 163; the new king's promise to put down heresy (Lutheranism), 164; papal confirmation to Danish bishoprics no longer sought, 166; the new bishops not consecrated, 167; Frederick's 'letters of protection' to preachers, 169; decisive victory of Lutheranism in Denmark, 171; confusion and civil war after Frederick's death, 176; Paul Eliesen's proposed Church reforms, 178; the Confession of Augsburg promulged, 179; Joachim Rönnov, 180; John Tausen, 181; the bishops reopen communications with Rome, 182; Christian III. on the throne, 183; the bishops deposed and 'superintendents' put in their places, 185; triumph of Luther, 186; present state of the Danish Church, 187

Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens (Mr. Kenyon's edition),

410 sqq.; discoveries of papyri in Egypt, 412; description of the papyrus on which this work was founded, 413; the Constitution much used by ancient schoolmasters, 415; the authorship, 416; date of composition, 418; style, 419; value of the contents, 422; a key to the literature of its period, 424; the author's method, 425; relation of the work to the Politics, 426; Mr. Kenyon's edi-

torial work, 428 Arnold, Sir E., The Light of the

World, 543
Assisted Education (the Government Bill, 1891), 492 sqq.; substance of the proposal, 492; differences in the position of schools in the North and in the South of England: class feeling, 493; difference between various classes of schools as to fees, 494; the limits of age, 495; amendments needed in the Bill, 496; payment of local rates, 497; date at which the change is to come into force, 498; need of maintaining voluntary schools, 499; the managing bodies of Church schools, ib.

BELCHER, Rev. Dr., Our Lord's Miracles of Healing,

Blore, Rev. Dr., The Weighty Charge, 537 Bourazan, Rev. F., A Sacred Dic-

tionary, 278

Bright, Rev. Canon, Fidelity and Sympathy united in True Teachers, 510

Christ or Plato?-review of the late Dr. Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, 1888 (The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church), 380 sqq.; outlines of Dr. Hatch's method, 381; criticism of his conclusion that for all outside of the Sermon on the Mount, Christianity is indebted to the mind of Greece: exegesis and doctrine, 383; ethics and organisation, 386; speculaand dogma, 389; the Church's use of terms belonging to current philosophic systems, 391; the idea of God among the Greeks, 393; Greek and Christian uses of the words λόγος, elκών, γεννάω, 397; Dr. Hatch's conclusions mean individualism in religion, 407; a mechanical view of history, 409

Classical Review, 279 Clayton, Rev. H. E., The 'Advancement' of our Lord's Humanity,

Clement (St.) of Rome: review of Bishop Lightfoot's work, 49 sqq.; who was Clement? 51; Letter to the Corinthians, 52; analysis of it, 53; its style rather homiletic than epistolary, 55; St. Clement's strong sense of the reign of law in nature, 56; his illustration of the Resurrection from the phœnix, ib.; argument from the principle of order in the material world, ib.; of 'high priest, priests, and Levites': various interpretations, 57; testimony to the New Testament, 58; his co-ordination of St. Peter and St. Paul as leaders of the Church, 59; why the epistle was not included in the canon, 59; the model liturgy in Apostolical Constitutions largely copied from it, 61; the Eucharistic references, 62; the so-called second epistle of St. Clement, 63; doubts and conjectures about it before Archbishop Bryennios's edition of the Constantinopolitan MS., 64; ancient use of the combined homily and epistle, 65

Colonial Episcopate, the, 429 sqq.; former spiritual neglect of colonists by England, 430; the first colonial bishop (1787), 431; the Colonial Bishoprics Fund started (1841): the first meeting, 432; work done by the aid of the Fund, 434; Lord Blachford's account of the old letters patent to colonial bishops, 436; Dr. Colenso's case, 438; claims of the Crown to nomination, 439; the Church in South Africa, 440; Mr. Gladstone's views on this subject, 441; yet more bishoprics needed, 442

Cozza Luzi, Abate: phototype reproduction of the Codex Vaticanus of the LXX, 247

Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature, 280

ARKEST England: review of 'General' Booth's work, 223 sqq.; contrasted with a kindred work by Mr. Charles Booth, 224; their respective classifications, 226; 'General' Booth's 'submerged tenth,' 227; Mr. C. Booth's suggested remedies, 229; the Church Army has anticipated 'General' Booth, 230; his remarks on the training of children, 232; his diatribe against present day emigration and private philanthropy, 233; his scheme of regeneration, 235; his 'shelters' and 'labour-yard,' 236; difficulties of these schemes, 237; the 'labour bureau,' 238; country farm, ib.; 'Over-Sea Colony,'
239; condition of the 'expelled'
from his colonies, ib.; other benevolent projects, 240; his 'Shelter Trophies,' 241; the Salvation Army's work in East London, 242; 'General' Booth's schemes have been all anticipated, 244

Deane, Rev. W. J., Pseudepigrapha,

Didon, Père, Jésus-Christ, 281 sqq.; excellence of the work, 282; his

DUB

HEB

assertion of the rights and limits of criticism in regard to Scripture, 282; the Conception, Adolescence, and Youth of Jesus, 284 sqq.; the Temptation in the wilderness, 286; deficiencies in the book: lax and slovenly scholarship, 293; exegesis of the fourth word from the Cross, 294; the walk to Emmaus, 297; the unity of principle in all the accounts of the Risen Lord, 300; the Leading Ideas of the Gospels, 303; 'informal memoirs,' ib.; the fullest specimen of a 'primi-tive Gospel' that spoken by St. Peter (Acts x. 34-44), 304; the special presentation of the life of Christ by each of the four Evangelists, 305; application of Ezek. i. 5 sqq. to the Evangelists, 308; analogy found in the biographies of remarkable men, 310; various treatment by the Evangelists of one incident common to them all, 313; general appraisement of Père Didon's work, 315 Dublin Review, 280

ECONOMIC REVIEW, The
279
English Historical Review, 279

GOD Incarnate: review of Bishop Kingdon's 'Bishop Paddock Lectures,' 131 sqq.; need of popular instruction in America on the Incarnation, 132; Bishop Kingdon's statement of the plural Personality of the Supreme Being, 134; Creation and the theory of Evolution, 135; the Bishop's in-terpretation of 'For us men, and for our salvation, was made Man,' 136; reasons for holding the Scotist view, ib.; the 'Theophanies' considered as 'proleptic manifestations of the Incarnate Lord,' 137; the 'perfection of sympathy' in Christ Incarnate, 138; Christ's growth in wisdom,' 139; His immunity from disease, 140; the Atonement, 141; necessity of Sacraments, 142; Confirmation, 144; the use of chrism in Confirmation, 145; Confession and Absolution, 146; Holy Eucharist, ib.; its Communion aspect, 147; Ordination, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, 148; the relation of Justification to Revelation, 149

Gospels, Recent works on the: Mr. J. Estlin Carpenter's The First Three Gospels, 29 sqq.; treat-ment of the testimony of Irenæus, 30; of the Fourth Gospel, 31; his neglect of the supernatural as a possible factor in the Gospels, 33; the essential unity of the New Testament writings, 35; the entrance and early progress of Christianity, 37; Mr. Car-penter's views on the 'formation of the Gospel tradition,' 37 sqq. how the followers of Jesus arrived at the conviction that He was the Messiah, 41; the miraculous birth of our Lord, 42; Rev. A. Wright's work on The Composition of the Gospels: good qualities in the book, 46; Dr. Dale's The Living Christ and the Four Gospels, 46; analysis of its arguments, 47

Grimley, Rev. H. N., The Prayer of Humanity, 275

HAMMOND, Rev. J., John Wesley, being Dead, yet Speaketh, 267

Speaketh, 267 Harris, W. T., Hegel's Logic, 540 Headlam, J. W., Election by Lot at Athens, 535

Heathcote, Rev. W. S., My Salvation Army Experience, 524
Hebrews, Epistle to the: review of Bishop Westcott's work, I sqg,; general character of the treatise, 2; question of a Hebrew original, 3; the Epistle was written to the Church of Jerusalem from Italy, 3 sq.; external testimony to the Epistle and its author, 5; Eusebius' account, 6; St. Clement's statement, 7; Origen's opinion, 9; Bishop Westcott's conclusions, 10; Delitsch's opinion, 11; the Epistle's drift and object, 13; its argument, 14; Protestant and Catholic views as to the

priesthood and Sacrifice of

ll anticibigrapha, ,281 sqq.; ,282; his

ly and

sqq.;

colo-

e first

I; the

tarted

432; of the

hford's patent

; Dr.

ims of

, 439;

a, 440 ;

on this

hoprics

pe re-

· Vati-

cal and

eview of

ork, 223 kindred

Booth,

assifica-

Booth's

Mr. C.

ies, 229;

icipated

his re-

present

ate phil-

me of re-

shelters '

difficul-

237; the

country

Colony,

expelled'

; other

40; his

41; the

' Booth's

280

Christ, 15; the real teaching of the writer of the Epistle, 17; the Church's interpretation, 10; exemplified in the Liturgy of St. James, 20; compared with St. Paul's Epistles, 21; and other primitive documents, 22; Eucharistic bearing of Heb. x. 19, 24; the θυσιαστήριου of Heb. xiii. 10, 25 Hunter, Rev. P. H., After the Exile, 257

INTERMEDIATE State, the: review of Canon Luckock's work, 204 sqq.; need of a proper corrective to the Calvinistic view of God's punishment of sin, 205; what is involved in the denial of intermediate state, 208; causes of the popular ignoring of it, 209; the three states of man's life, 210; popular depreciation of the doctrines of the resurrection and the judgment, 211; proofs of the belief in an intermediate state, 212; the doctrine traced through the Jewish Church, 215; Jewish conception of death, 216; Sheol, 218; Gehenna, 219; parable of Dives and Lazarus, 220; view of the Primitive Christian Church on the intermediate state, 221; the idea of the Church in the unseen world carrying on the work begun here on earth, 222; the condition of the heathen, ib. Iverach, Professor J., St. Paul, 550

L AY SERMONS for Practical People, 278 Lightfoot, Bishop, Sermons by, 272 Loraine, Rev. N., The Battle of Belief, 542 Lyra Consolationis, 539

M ARIAN persecution, the (review of vol. iv. of Canon Dixon's History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction), 188 sqq.; the respective shares of Mary and Philip in the persecution, 190; Bonner, 191; Mary's policy, 192; brutality of the judges, 193; behaviour of Convocation, 194;

NEW

Mary's letters enjoining the punishment of heretics, 195; treatment of those who recanted, 196; Cranmer, ib.; character of Pole, 197; constancy of the sufferers, 198; results of the persecution, 200; Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia, 202; Canon Dixon's character of Pope Paul IV., 203 Methodism and the Church of England, by a Layman, 270

Monckton Milnes, Richard (Lord Houghton), review of Mr. T. Wemyss Reed's Memoir, 445 sqq.; Milnes's father, 446; boyhood and youth of Richard Milnes, 447; University life, 448; life on the Continent, 450; Rome, 451; Greece, 452; return to England, 453; fame as a host, 454; M.P. for Pontefract: political position, 456; reformatories, 458; made a peer, 459; his pamphlet on the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, 460; poetry, 461; friend of literary men: charities, 462; religious opinions, 463; various estimates of his character, 464 Moore, Rev. Canon Aubrey L.,

Some Aspects of Sin, 263
Moore, Rev. Dr., Dante and his early Biographers, 523
Moorhouse, Bishop (Manchester),

The Teaching of Christ, 500 Morris, Mr. Lewis, the poetry of, 115 sqq.; various standards of critics of poetry, 117; fitness of moral truths for poetic expression, 118; Mr. Morris's characteristic of putting into verse the ethical principles of common life, 119; ungrounded reaction in the critics' estimate of his verse, 120; examples of Mr. Morris's style, 122; AVision of Saints, 125; estimate of its poetry, 126; the presentment of Elizabeth Fry and Father Damien, 128; Mr. Morris's blank verse, 129; defects, 130 Mortimer, Rev. A. G., Notes on the Seven Penitential Psalms, 554

N EW BOOKS, New Editions, Periodicals, &c.: Brief Notes on, 276 NEW

Newman, F. W., Contributions chiefly to the Early History of the late Cardinal Newman, 541 Notes and Questions on the Catholic Faith and Religion, 545

OFFICIAL Year Book, Church of England, 1891, 277 Orr, Mrs. Sutherland, Life and Letters of Robert Browning, 545 Overton, Rev. Canon, John Wesley, 267

Oxford Movement, the: review of Dean Church's work, 271, 318 sqq.; simultaneous appearance of Cardinal Newman's Letters and Correspondence, 320; estimate of Newman, ib.; workers preparatory to the Movement, 322; Keble's Assize Sermon, 323; Newman the real originator of the Tracts—the beginning of the Movement, 324; Pusey the greatest factor in it, 325; Isaac Williams's Tract 'On Reserve,' 327; Keble's on 'Mysticism,' 328; 'No. 90,' 329; the beginning of the end of Newman as an Anglican, 330; Mr. Ward, ib.; the early Tractarians were men of deep piety, of learning and culture, 332; they were hard workers in their parishes, 333; present-day High Churchmen, ib.

PAGET, Rev. Canon, The Spirit of Discipline, 275 Pearson, Bishop, An Exposition of

the Creed, 277
Perpetua and Felicitas, The Acts of the Martyrdom of (review of Messrs. Harris and Gifford's edition of), 68 sqq.; interest to be found in matters relating to the Christians of the Early Church, 70; characteristics of ancient accounts of martyrdoms, 72; Ruinart's Acta Sincera, 74; criteria of the genuineness of Acts of Martyrdom, 75; the martyrdom of Polycarp, 76; the persecution of Christians in Gaul in 177, ib.; the story of the African martyrdoms in the beginning of the

ROY

third century, 77; Perpetua and her companions, 79; Perpetua's character, 80; her vision, ib.; the vision of Saturus, 82 n.; the condition of children dying unbaptized, 83; the manner of Perpetua's and her companions' death, 84; why the Acts of Perpetua's martyrdom were originally written in Greek, 87 Pitchford, Rev. J. W., Beata Spes,

Prayer Book, the original Manuscript of the, 276, 465 sqq.; the Facsimile of the Black Letter Prayer Book of 1636, 467; Mr. Parker's work on the various revisions of the Book, 468; the recent facsimile of 'The Annexed Book,' 469; the signatures of bishops, &c., 470; erasures and insertions, 471; the 'Black Rubric,' 475; Ordination Service, 476; version of the Psalms: mistakes copied into modern Prayer Books, 477; marked passages from the LXX, 482; other minor differences, 484; the Communion Office, 485; Epistles, Gospels, and Collects, 486; irregularity as to stops and capitals, 488; the Thirty-nine Articles,

RAWLINSON, Rev. Canon, Men of the Bible: Ezra and Nehemiah, 255 Reany, Rev. G. S., Why I left Con-

gregationalism, 524 Röhricht, Reinhold, Bibliotheca

Geographica Palestinæ, 259
Romestin, Rev. H. de, How knoweth this Man Letters? 514
Rossetti, Christina G., Poems, 264
Royal Edinburgh: review of Mrs. Oliphant's work, 335 sqq.; Mrs. Oliphant's fitness for the task of recording its history, 336; the illustrations, 337; Queen Margaret, 338; her chapel, 339; Holyrood House, 341; Canongate, ib.; 'the Stewards of Scotland': origin of the Stuarts, 342; misfortunes of the early kings of that family, 343; gene-

e pun-

treat-

l, 196;

ferers,

cution,

a Obe-Dixon's

V., 203

f Eng-

(Lord

Ir. T.

15 sqq.

yhood

Milnes,

life on

e, 451;

ngland,

; M.P. l posi-

, 458; mphlet

n kingiend of

62 ; revarious r, 464

rey L.,

and his

hester),

etry of,

ards of

tness of

expres-

charac-

erse the

non life,

n in the se, 120; s style,

25; esti-

the pre-

Fry and

Ir. Mor-

ects, 130

es on the

Editions, ief Notes

15, 554

500

ral character of the Stuarts, 347; John Knox, 348; Mary, Queen of Scots, 349; George Buchanan, 350; Edinburgh after the accession of James VI. to the throne of England, 351; literary celebrities, ib.; Allan Ramsay, 352; Robert Burns, 354; his 'Clorinda,' 355; memories of Scott, ib.

SADLER, Rev. M. F., The Epistles of St. Paul to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, 1, 252

Sanday, Rev. Dr., The Oracles of

God, 506

Scartazzini's Prolegomeni on Dante, 358 sqg.; Dante's private life, 359; public life, 360; exile, 361; Beatrice, 364; Dante's inner life, 368; various works of Dante, 371; the first conception of the Commedia, 373; arithmetical symmetry of its structure, ib.; the allegory in Inferno i. and ii., 375; the inmates of the three realms, 377; bibliography, 370

realms, 377; bibliography, 379
Scott, Sir Walter, The Journal of, 89 sqq.; Scott's father, 89; Walter Scott's school and university life, 90; the Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border, 91; marriage, 92; success of his early poems, ib.; Waverley Novels, and other works (1814-29), 93; Scott's behaviour under the reverse of fortune, 95; his death, 96; influence of his period upon his writings: his poetry, ib.; his keen sense of the prose of life,

woo

98; the influence of the politics of his day upon Scott, 100; state of religion in Scott's days, 103; the originator of the historical novel, 105; wholesomeness of the recreation he affords, 106; the attacks of Carlyle and Macaulay, 107; Scott's opinions respecting the Covenanters, 109; afterwards modified, 110; alleged influence of Scott's writings in neutralizing the effect of the Reform Bill of 1832, 114

Shaw, Rev. W. F., A Manual for

Catechising, 554
S.P.C.K., recent publications of,

278 Stanley, Dean, Sermons and Essays

on the Apostolical Age, 277 Studia Biblica (ed. Professors Driver, Cheyne, and Sanday), vol. ii., 261

Symonds, J. A., Introduction to Study of Dante, 519

THOMPSON, Bishop (Mississippi), The World and the Man, 274

VAUGHAN, Dean, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1, 250

WESTCOTT, Bishop (Durham), Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West, 551

Williams, Isaac, Selection from the Writings of, 549 Woodruff, C. H., The Children's Year, 554

PRINTED BY

SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE LONDON

e politics so; state ys, 103; istorical eness of ds, 106; de and opinions ers, 109; ; alleged tings in the Re-

nual for

ions of,

d Essays 277 rofessors Sanday),

ection to

(Missisand the

e Epistle 50

Durham), istory of the West,

ion from

Children's